



**INSIDE THE
BRITISH ISLES**

ARTHUR GLEASON

**CHAUTAUQUA
HOME READING SERIES**

A. M. Byford.

May. 19th.

**INSIDE
THE BRITISH ISLES**

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

BY
ARTHUR GLEASON
AUTHOR OF "GOLDEN LADS," ETC.



The Chautauqua Press
CHAUTAUQUA, NEW YORK
MCMXVIII

Copyright, 1917, by
THE CENTURY CO.

Published, May, 1917

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I DEMOCRACY ON THE MARCH	3
II LABOR	14
The Social Revolution in England	14
The Discovery	41
Democratic Control	53
The Pioneers	58
Reasonable Satisfaction	89
III WOMEN	95
Emancipation	95
The Feminists of the War Office and Admiralty	118
Bowing Them Out	127
Disorganization	144
England's Policewomen	154
IV IRELAND	173
The Irish Question	173
Young England Speaks	186
The Siamese Twin	192
Poverty: The Real Irish Question	206
V SOCIAL STUDIES	228
What of England?	228

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
	Why They Will Win	231
	Dragons' Teeth	242
	Change	250
	A Batch of Papers	260
	Free Speech	274
	The Right of Asylum	281
	Public Opinion	295
	Where the Lane Turns	307
	The New Way	315
	The New Americanism	320
	Nationality	330
VI LLOYD-GEORGE	341
VII VALE	350
APPENDIX	357
INDEX	423

**INSIDE THE BRITISH
ISLES**

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

CHAPTER I

DEMOCRACY ON THE MARCH

ENGLAND has acted on the world as a principle of release for freedom, sometimes by irritating it into activity, as with the American colonies, sometimes by coöperating with it, as in Canada and Australia. The balance of power has departed from England to a wider area. But the principle of government which creates and directs that power continues to be an English principle. It is the principle of democratic control. One hundred years ago England was in a war in which her three leaders were Pitt, Wellington, and Nelson, three Englishmen. To-day Great Britain is in a war in which her three leaders are Lloyd-George, Haig, and Beatty, a Welshman, a Scotchman, and an Irishman. That is of course

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

only a chance illustration, but it serves to show the fact that the field of opportunity has broadened, and that England is no longer the overshadowing power in a union, but is the equal among equals.

If that extension of power among her members is true of England on her island, it is also true of her among her colonies. Already the new cabinet has called the dominions to a special war conference. This is the first step in a momentous change in the constitution of the empire. The peoples of the dominions are not contented with their status, and they refuse to go on indefinitely under the present arrangement, which focuses all imperial responsibility in the hands of statesmen of the British Isles. They determined to have a voice in foreign policy, and in the creation of an interlocking imperial domestic policy, which will organize the resources of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and India. The constitutional reconstruction calls for an imperial cabinet, answerable in authority to an imperial parliament of all the democracies of the empire.

The result of this will be the most populous, largest, most powerful state in the world, and that

DEMOCRACY ON THE MARCH

state will not be an autocracy. It will be a commonwealth, an agreement of equals. It will act from one will, with one purpose. The operations of that will inside so vast an organism will seem almost like a process of nature. Its influence will be decisive on the immediate future of the human race. Under the perfected internal organization, which is the very purpose of the union, the food-supply of a quarter of mankind will be guaranteed. The land question will be solved. The balance of agriculture to industry will be determined and established. The problems of labor will be dealt with in a freedom of opportunity and an increase of productive power which would have seemed utopian to an earlier generation. That imperial parliament will be a league of peace which will give the first stable basis for a world peace.

This will be the greatest extension of democratic control ever applied to the map of the world. The dimensions of it are so large that the imagination even of its projectors has not wakened to what it implies. A great organism of democracies, excepting only India, will exist in a world still half in political bondage. It will

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

carry its community far along in the twofold purpose of all government—the control of environment and the betterment of human relationships. Suppose the bundle of states in Europe were suddenly to be thrown together in a vast republican state of common purpose, determined on a unified domestic and foreign policy, then we should have no more amazing entity than in this plan of the new British commonwealth. Impossible, of course, for Europe, because there is no central principle, overriding differences of tradition, race, and language; but possible and about to be consummated in the empire, because the central principle of democratic control is accepted, and because the kinship of blood and language exists. And it is all so obvious. The synthesis, once stated, demands its own realization. It is like the enlightenment which the faithful believe we shall receive after death, when we shall say, "Why, of course."

Such is the dream which British statesmen will proceed to put into execution at the close of the war. It is the war whose pressure has coalesced these five democracies, each busy with its own self-contained and isolated life. A common danger

DEMOCRACY ON THE MARCH

and a common experience of suffering forced the realization of what a thoroughgoing partnership would bring in organization for industry and in the attainment of a good life. The war created a highly desirable friction between Great Britain and her colonial democracies, which revealed the present unsatisfactory status and the need of a new order. Out of that friction has come the vision of the new commonwealth.

In the light of this far-flung scheme, the cabinet changes at Westminster seem petty. But they are actually in part a response to it. In England's reach toward this new synthesis she has instinctively turned to the men who have shown, either recently or in long years of service, an understanding that England is not the British Empire, but that the British Empire is in process of becoming itself a single state, the greatest in the world. The changes in the ministry are not alone expressions of the desire to win the war, but they indicate a drift of thought, only half-conscious as yet, toward the future commonwealth, toward the unification of the little unrelated democracies which England has sown around the world.

The British democracy believes it has found its

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

group of leaders for the present crisis in the new cabinet. Its will is to win the war, and it begins, though dimly, to sense the need of imperial reconstruction. When the need swings back acutely to the internal problems of labor adjustment, this cabinet will be swiftly displaced if it fails to function in the new demand, or certain of its members will pass over to the new imperial ministry and parliament. The British public has to think in three separate and almost unrelated provinces. It finds itself unable to do this simultaneously, so it takes them up in turn. It expresses that shift of attention by cabinet changes. It has to think in terms of domestic policy, of imperial policy, and of international policy. The Tory type of mind has a traditional imperial and foreign policy which is firm, clear-cut, and which carries a weight of experience. (I am not speaking of "polities" in using the word "Tory." I am speaking of the political philosophy, the type of mind, of such men as Milner, Balfour, Bonar Law, Curzon, and Carson.) So, when the democracy found itself at grips with a crisis which calls for an imperial and foreign policy, it turned to leaders who inherited that tradition and who therefore could an-

DEMOCRACY ON THE MARCH

surer the immediate need. The claim of certain observers that the present group of imperial executives, agricultural and educational experts, and business captains, are a reactionary force, revealing the breakdown of democracy in time of strain, is a failure to see one of the central principles of democratic government. Democratic government is a government by experts, interpreting the collective will of the people. We shall probably see a series of cabinet shifts in the next five years, as each of the three great problems of British policy is taken up. The lime-light will flit from Manchester and South Wales to Ireland, and then to Australia, and then to Russia, and public opinion will demand a very distinct set of faculties, and therefore of leaders, in dealing with each of these various questions.

Since the war began many persons have asked, Can a democracy produce leaders of the same merit as an autocracy? And the answer has often been No. But the question fails to state the problem. War leaders are one requirement, imperial leaders are another, and the creators of domestic policy are a third. Let us state the need in these terms:

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

1. Can a democracy produce leaders in peace times who can shape legislation and give guidance to the democratic movement? The mass of the people have developed a collective will, which demands a reconstruction of the state, expressed in terms of parliamentary control (manhood suffrage, the predominance of the House of Commons over the House of Lords); and a reconstruction of industry and the institution of property, expressed in terms of social legislation, affecting land reform, minimum wage, and control of collective enterprise, such as mines and railways, and further expressed in free experiment outside legal enactment, though later to be incorporated in legislative acts, such as workshop councils. Those leaders of peace Great Britain produced. Her swift adjustments to the demands of modern self-conscious democracy have proved that she is the fertile mother of democratic initiative.

2. Can a democracy produce leaders under the strain of international crisis who can carry through a determined policy demanding organization, efficiency, applied science, and a spiritual unity? This requirement is distinct from the re-

DEMOCRACY ON THE MARCH

quirements of a wise domestic policy. The reason is plain. The dealings of a nation with its citizens have reached a level of sanity, intelligence, and ethical decency which the dealings of nation with nation have not reached. Internationally, we are in the jungle. To handle these international relationships of greed and hate, the nation has to employ brute force. It has to turn its farmers into killers. It has to make shells in place of workers' cottages. But even while this need is most acute, and because it is acute, there arose in Great Britain the demand for a policy which would draw the sprawled-out empire into one state. The present cabinet is the answer to that demand.

To the question, Can a democracy produce leaders? the British people reply that they are selecting their leaders according to their need, and that, in doing so, they are proving a democratic principle. It is not an abrogation of the democratic principle when a people turns to its experts. It is one expression of the democratic principle. For democracy brought in two things when it entered life with the organization of the industrial revolution. It brought in a mass

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

movement and it brought in specialization. The collective will must always turn to experts to organize its desires into action. It will control those experts, but it will never supersede them. It exercises its control in the choice of them, not in itself attempting tasks of which it is ignorant. A democracy in itself can liberate only an impulse. It cannot frame emergency measures by initiative and referendum. It will always be called on from time to time to pass over its power to a handful of specialists and trust them to use its mass momentum in the right direction toward the desired end.

The democratic movement began consciously with the purpose of freeing the human race from poverty. But it has steadily undergone a broadening of purpose under the pressure of its own requirements. It has found that for self-preservation it must include the release of talent and the creation of spiritual values in its program. To produce leaders and to enhance the meaning of life are as much within its province as a proper standard of living in terms of hours and wages. It recognizes its need of an aristocracy of talent. The leaders of the democratic movement state

DEMOCRACY ON THE MARCH

this: such men as A. E., Wells, Zimmern, and Sidney Webb. This aristocracy will include social experts, artists, ethical leaders, teachers, imperial executives, organizers, and specialists in foreign policy. War is only one of the many situations where the democracy, with its distributed responsibility, does not possess in itself the necessary intelligence and unity of policy to master the sudden crisis. The democracy is only fulfilling its own nature in recognizing a diversity of gifts.

But through all the adjustments of the coming years, calling for expert treatment, the principle of democratic control will prevail. In time the democracy will develop its own tradition of policy and service and generate its own leaders. The common people of Great Britain have never spoken. It was therefore believed they were dumb. But they were not dumb; they were only inarticulate. The common people of Great Britain have never acted with common purpose to one end. It was therefore believed that they were impotent. But they were not impotent; they were only unawakened. Now they are learning to speak and to act.

CHAPTER II

LABOR

THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND

THE opinion has been wide-spread among social workers in America that the war has crushed liberalism in England. They have formed this opinion because social work has been postponed, trade-union rules have been abrogated, dissenters like Bertrand A. W. Russell silenced, Russian revolutionary centers in London suppressed. But it is a characteristic of experts working in details to miss the main currents of tendency. No friend of radical democracy need be worried by the results of the last two years. The blood spilled by the working-classes at the front has been justified by the profound modifications wrought in English consciousness. A nation mobilized and under arms is a rich field for radical ideas. Blood fertilizes the soil for change. Those of the school of Curzon and Gwynne, who

LABOR

believed that the good old days of special privilege would be restored by conscription, are doomed to an awakening more thorough than befell the French reactionaries of 1790. For this is not an affair of a few noble heads. It is the remaking of a nation.

England is taking strides toward coöperative socialism. For the first time in their history, the English are thinking in terms of a state—"a modern state, in all its complexity, with scientific laws and regulations." This is a view "utterly strange to English thought, steeped as it always had been in empiricism, and only inclined to such piecemeal legislation as a particular grievance or a particular occasion might demand." I am quoting a government investigator. These tendencies were already in operation before the war; but what might have required twenty-five years to bring to a head, the war has accelerated, intensified, and even altered.

It is a misreading of English character to think that anything remotely resembling the state socialism of Germany, the card-indexing of the community for vocational training, the regimenting of the intellectual life into a body of state-

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

controlled professors, will result from the present English revolution. The social change in England is not coming with any such over-emphasized nationalism. The Englishman wants to be let alone for all his personal choices. He wants to disagree with official statements. He will not be coerced even for "his good," as that good is seen by another. Nor will the change come as an indeterminate, spreading internationalism, such as has infected radical thought for half a century. It will be English, inside an English environment.

There are two truths so plain that we wonder it required a hundred years to find them out. It is the war that has finally revealed them to our blind eyes. The first truth is that high wages give high productiveness. A well-fed, self-respecting, healthy workman can do more work than an under-nourished, servile workman. If the employer wants a good product and plenty of it, he must pay a living wage. The second truth is that workmen must work efficiently if they wish high wages. If they cut down productiveness there is no money to pay them. The war has smoked the workers out. Their sacred secret

LABOR

processes which required hours to work have turned out as simple as building-blocks. It is public knowledge now, the time it takes to do a piece of factory work. For years the worker has been limiting his output. A manufacturer of marine engines states that where thirteen rivets were turned out before the war, seventy are now being made by the same number of workers. The worker is making the same fight here that he made when he broke the first machines. The machines were robbing him of his living, he thought. Instead of that, they have given more men a better living. Of late years the worker has been fighting his own productivity. How is shrinking wealth to give him an expanding wage? Where is the money to come from? As a method in a given emergency, sabotage and limitation of output are effective; but as a nation-wide policy they are instruments that cut the hands of the user. The trade-unions surrender their hard-won regulations, and suddenly production leaps up as if it had been released from a dead-weight. They are still insisting on government guarantees that the old restrictions will be handed back to them after the war. It would be flattering to write

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

that it is by labor that the constructive thinking is being done, but it would be untrue. There is absence of patient thought, lack of a constructive program, the muddle of a helpless creature caught unawares in a tidal wave.

It was the making of shells that taught England the new synthesis of capital and labor. Suddenly she was forced to turn out huge quantities of a product in order to save the lives of her people. Under that tragic pressure she had to learn overnight how to get a large product. She began in the manner dear to ruling classes: she started an old-time "personal-morality" campaign of the evangelistic sort, and her most gifted exhorter, Lloyd-George, went out to down drink. She then preached thrift to the factory-worker. But she soon dropped that way of getting at it; she stopped lecturing the laboring-man for his bad habits.

And swiftly she found the solution. It is this:

State ownership of some factories; state control of many factories; state oversight of an ever-increasing number of factories; a conscription of abnormal profits for the community; a living wage; decent working conditions; limited hours

LABOR

of labor; no restriction of output; no sabotage; no discrimination by workers against workers, but all to be employed, union and non-union, male and female; efficiency; the use of machinery up to its capacity instead of dribbling a process through a day where a half-day of proper handling would have completed the product.

There are broken planks all along the length of this platform. But every sag has meant decreased output, a longer war, more young men killed in battle. And once England had settled the main question with a measure of honesty, she found that some other things were added unto her. When she paid a living wage to people who had never had it before, and put before them a national ideal instead of a benefit for another class, she found that two million persons joined her national savings fund, thereby breaking an immemorial British habit. She found that her prisons had fewer inmates, that the personal morality of her inhabitants was in the main improved. She found that her school children in factory communities were better nourished than they had been in the memory of the examining physicians. She found that her woman question

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

solved itself. The very suffragette leaders, such as Mrs. Drummond and Mrs. Pankhurst, who had put gray hairs on Lloyd-George's head and lines of worry into his face, recruited soldiers, explained the national need to the men miners of the north counties, assisted in organizing masses of "unemployable" women into industrial workers, and were welcomed by Lloyd-George and the Government as efficient helpers in unifying the nation. And, far more important than the co-operation of a handful of leaders, the unrest and discontent of large numbers of women became transformed into energy.

While it is true that only half a million women have entered industry, that figure is only a fraction of the number of women who have transferred their activity from domestic service and the parasitic trades into the main channels of industry. In munitions alone five hundred thousand women have stepped over from unregulated hours and low wages to sharply defined hours and comparatively high wages. These women, and several hundred thousand others in factory processes, in railway, tram-car, and omnibus work, and in business superintendence, have "tasted

LABOR

blood." By that I mean they have won an increased freedom and independence, however imperfect even yet, and a higher wage. To send them "home" will prove a task larger than the paper resolutions of any men's trade-union, that women workers must give up their jobs.

It is one more of time's ironic revenges that it is the entrance of women upon the scene which has precipitated social questions to solution, where before they were seething in separate, repellent elements. Woman's long campaign for the vote supplied the needed intellectual criticism of plural voting and of suffrage restricted to a property qualification. "Manhood" suffrage will be granted. It is not possible for a nation to deny a vote to men who have been ready to die for that nation. This manhood suffrage will include votes for women, for the women have mobilized with an equal loyalty.

Woman's irritating presence in industry has emphasized the demand for proper working conditions. It has sharpened the wage controversy, and it has revealed the need of far-reaching measures to deal with the unemployment situation that the nation will face on the day of peace. Women

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

are not going to enter industry. They have already entered it, and half a million fresh workers have been added. It is clear that increasing the number of workers does not lessen the problem of a living wage. There is only one answer to the violently acute situation which has been forced by these women, and which will come to a crisis when five million men hang their khaki in the closet. The areas of production must be widened not tenderly and with the imperceptible gradualness of a natural process, but swiftly.

(1) The land must be broken up into small holdings. Coöperation in produce and marketing must be practised among the peasant tenants. Ireland has blazed the way here.

(2) The state must institute fields of activity at home, helping to establish new industries, such as dye-works. It must make use of an immense amount of new automatic machinery, installed to make shells, and adapted to an expansion of general engineering work and to the creation of new industries. The head of a motor-car company told me that two thirds of his present machinery has been created since the war. The report of the British Association states, "For the first time

LABOR

in the history of the west of Scotland engineering shops had been filled with modern machine tools.” This enormous investment cannot be scrapped.

(3) The state must greatly extend its sphere of activities throughout the empire in cattle-raising, in developing raw lands, in producing commodities from the land.

These methods will be used to meet the unemployment situation by furnishing new jobs, and to meet the burden of increased taxation by giving an increased income. The larger program will of course be postponed till its advocates are more numerous and better organized. Such a program will include:

(1) An extension of transportation facilities, a greatly enlarged use of waterways, the building of new and better roads.

(2) Improved housing. The foul slums of great cities and towns, the vile homes of agricultural laborers, will have to be razed by as drastic a plan as that by which Haussmann drew his blue pencil down through the jungle of Paris. New dwellings in the place of the “lung blocks” must be built.

(3) Afforestation. If it proves true that

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

there are several million acres in the British Isles that are unfit for intensive agriculture, this area affords an opportunity for forest development, which in eighty years would offer rich returns to the state.

Under such an extension of enterprise there would be plenty of work after the war, and therefore plenty of jobs. The problem is how to obtain the money with which to finance the work. The war has shown how to get the money. The conscription of profits, death duties, and the taxation of incomes have availed, with new areas of production, to give a more wide-spread, better-distributed prosperity to England than she enjoyed before the war. It is the line of solution that will be enforced after the war. The exact pressure that will enforce it is the demand for a continuation of the present high wages.

This program is being postponed as long as possible. Its items will be applied unevenly, and parts will go neglected. Committees of Parliament are sure to bring in ingenious little outlines for legislation, which will affect a few thousand workers, while the army will demobilize at the rate of five thousand a day. But for every fail-

LABOR

ure in boldness and energy, for every lag in execution, the nation will pay in decreased exports, falling wages, the pressure of taxation, and a wrangle between masters and men. The new order of life is still badly delayed at many points. The lot of the agricultural laborer is miserable. The "East Ends" of the industrial cities remain sodden. An immense number of workers are being underpaid, for the rise in wages has reached only a fraction. A ministry of commerce and a ministry of labor are needed at once, and in the ministry of labor there should be a department for women's work, conducted by women under-secretaries.

Wages and hours remain the heart of the social movement. The emphasis will not shift from wages and hours. But a new demand has been added to these "old timers." It is the demand by labor for a voice in the control of its working conditions. Mr. Lloyd-George responded to this demand by greatly increasing the scope of welfare work in factories. Through the famous manufacturer and social worker, Seebohm Rowntree, he has put protective agencies at work in munition factories which affect the lives of half

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

a million persons who were not safeguarded to the same extent formerly. This safeguarding is done by welfare secretaries, whose duty it is to study the health, home conditions, and sanitary appliances of women. Grievances of workers are laid before these secretaries. Welfare secretaries are not a new arrival in British industry, but there were few of them in relation to the immense numbers of factories and workers. This movement toward conducting industry in its social relationship from the point of view of the worker is in its beginning. Labor will press on for an increasing recognition of its right to be heard in management in workshop adjustments, the speed of machinery, rest-times, hours of work, details of discipline, and the grading of labor.

As this tide of reform rises higher, there is a back wash. Class education, land monopoly, a state church, persist down to our own day. England has continued in a modified, far less harsh form those special privileges of a ruling class that in France led to the overthrow of the nobility and the clergy. The industrial revolution of a century ago suddenly altered the texture of feudal English life, just as it would have altered France

LABOR

without the French Revolution. It added a new upper layer to the pressure from overhead on the manual worker in agriculture and industry, at the same time that it gave an ever-increasing population a share in the means of production. But the coming of machinery, creating a new world, was powerless in England to disturb the big land holdings, the church, and restricted education. They have continued to govern the conditions of life. The best defense of the class system which I have recently seen is that given in lectures to the University of Pennsylvania by Geoffrey Butler under the title of "The Tory Tradition." He clearly shows the contribution which has been made by the Tory rejection of a utilitarian standard, their distrust of sectional control, their insistence on the organic conception of the state, their belief in the power of tradition and the ancient processes of government, their emphasis on national duties, and therefore on a far-sighted foreign policy. He says, "Our system of classes represents the effect of selection by the capacity to govern." And again, "Heredity is no Tory invention, but a scientific fact."

In any analysis of unseemly class prepon-

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

derance the honest student of English conditions has to qualify the downright statement. Thus the landed gentry have often exercised a personal care for their tenants and the village community that the modern liberal captain of industry has sometimes neglected to exercise toward his employees. But the land monopoly has prevented England from being self-supporting and from relieving the pressure on industry of an over-crowded labor supply. It has robbed her of a sturdy land-owning peasantry like the French, and has given her in their place a city-bred, under-sized, intellectually feeble, morally infirm lower class.

The intellectuals of the public schools and of Oxford and Cambridge have supplied a poise and dignity to modern life that a mediocre democracy lacks. Their graduates have given honest leadership in the Government. Recently their young men have gone gallantly to a service from which there is no returning. But much of the defense for the rigid, medieval class system, in so far as it possesses an intellectual basis, has been supplied by public school and university men. They are living in the home of lost causes.

LABOR

The belated Tory Church of England clergy have continued to be an ameliorating influence in their communities. Their sane manner of living, their personal kindness, their patient absorption in the humble lives about them—all these make a contribution we overlook in our easy generalizations on the decayed church. And there are abounding elements inside the established church itself that are as liberal as any elements in modern life. That church still has wise leaders, like Dean Welldon of Manchester and a dozen others. The sacramental view of life has profound and permanent values for certain persons. But when all has been said, it remains true that the church, with its compromised theology, its indifference to social injustice, its ignorance of where the modern fight for righteousness is being waged, its land-holding, its taxation, its absence of intellectual force in seeking truth, has acted as a deterrent in the emancipation of the masses. A state religion has been a soporific, drugging the laborer to believe that his lot in life was a part of the scheme of things. As an institution the church, and as a body the clergy, have not sought equality for their communities. The present National

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

Mission of Repentance and Hope, the most ambitious crusade the church has launched in many years, has been swung over into an evangelistic campaign against the personal vices of drink and sexual indulgence, and into an old-fashioned appeal for personal righteousness and the deepening of the religious life. The majority of the bishops remain blind to the demand of the workers for an economic underpinning to their lives. The workers believe that the way to a proper life is by taking a hand in the control of industry, by a living wage, and by fewer hours of work. They are frankly uninterested in the restriction of public houses and a more diligent attendance in places of worship till they see that their larder and their leisure are guaranteed.

These, then, are the forces of reaction tightening themselves for the struggle. These great estates of the landed gentry, the clergy, and the public school and university men will die hard in defense of the class system. They will be powerfully supported by the individualistic capitalist, avid for his profits, and by the timid, unintelligent middle class, fearful of its narrow income from rents, stock-holding, and small investment.

LABOR

But the same quick action that turned out shells by the acre will be enforced by the return of a nation in arms. It is not that they will use the rifle to shoot. It is that their strength has been compacted where their eye can see it, their organization ready-made for them, their service to the nation acknowledged. Soldiers and workers are the same men, inside the small area of an island. At one stroke war won those things for which in peace a portion of the English people seek in vain: proper food, correct conditions for efficiency, a pension for dependents, high honor for service, a common sacrifice, and, embracing all like a climate, a favoring public opinion, a great universal equality. They will demand that the same humanity be let loose into their daily life of the factories. Is the basic work of peace less worthy than trench routine?

There has been a certain vital force in new countries that England has lacked in recent years. Some of that living element went out to America and the colonies. It founded free institutions, established a wider equality, liberated a play for individual initiative. It left England grayer and heavier than in its great epochs. Next to the

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

sleeping strength of the Russian peasantry, the English mass is the slowest-moving force in the modern European world.

Observers of England have written down this slackening of effort as laziness. But "laziness" and "drink" and "thriftlessness" are the invincible resort of an imperfect analysis. What was the cause of that laziness? I believe that we have the answer in the weakness that sets in when an organism gets out of touch with its environment. All the conditions of modern life were changing rapidly, and England revealed little adaptability in fitting herself to the change. What the war has made clear is that England was losing her stride in the modern world. She was lagging in agriculture, industry, and applied science. To put the matter clearly and frankly, an anemia had spread over English life in recent generations. Through lack of vocational training, the working-man had lost ambition, and his power of production had lost pace with German and American workers. The huddled, sheltered, unproductive lives of middle-class people were often without direction and purpose because they were untrained. The upper class had lost power

LABOR

of constructive leadership in the traditions of an education unrelated to the realities of modern life.

This war has wakened England. It has made the working-man work at full-tilt for the first time in his life. He has been willing to do it, because the product served a national purpose instead of the profit of another person. He has been physically able to do it, because an increased wage gave him better food. He has discovered how to do it, because the pressure of necessity has unlocked brain cells which in ordinary times would have required a term of education to coördinate. The war has turned the middle-class home inside out, and freed the respectable unemployed into usefulness. It has given new and more active forms of employment to women caught in domestic service and the parasitic trades of "refined" dressmaking, millinery, and candy manufacture. Finally, the war has given a career to upper-class Englishmen. For the first time in their lives they feel they have found something active to do through noble sacrifice. The sigh of relief that went up at the discovery that life was at last worth living, if only because of its

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

brevity, was echoed in the poetry of officers as it drifted back from the trenches.

The key to the present situation is the sudden enormous release of energy. Male labor has felt it, and has responded with increased production. Women have felt it, and have transferred their activities from low-pressure drudgery and parasitic employments to the main channels of industry. The directors and capitalists have felt it, and have sanctioned new areas of production, new automatic machinery, and more liberal terms for their workers. The state has felt it, and has taken a direct hand in the encouragement and control of industry. An incredible amount of energy has been let loose in England which before was lying latent in underpaid, undernourished working-men, in individualistic businessmen, in unimaginative government officials, in extra daughters in the household, and in unattached women of a moderate income and no profession.

A spiritual transformation would come to pass if atoms were dissociated and the latent energy in matter released into a torpid world. What coal and electricity and radium accomplish in burning through obstruction and speeding up life would

LABOR

be transcended by that new amazing release of force. But that very thing took place in the social organism. Industrial labor and the home were each an "indestructible atom," the final unit that could not be pried open, or separated into parts. And suddenly it was broken up, and an immense energy set going in the community.

To maintain this increased activity after the war will require an enlarged system of state education. Vocational training must be given to the young in place of the present laissez-faire policy, which lets children slip out from control, at the age of fourteen and even younger, into "blind-alley" pursuits. England will have to be remodeled or else lose her place among the nations.

If she fails to take action in accelerating industrial democracy, she will see her surviving young men sailing in droves for Canada and Australia. The colonies are far-sighted, and their propaganda in England is continuous, and has greatly increased since the beginning of the war. Show-windows on the Strand and King's Road, and like strategic points of great cities, are filled with the genial products of the soil and the mines,—ears

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

of grain and slags of metal,—and the background a gay painting of an overseas city, with its hospitable harbor. Pleasant-voiced and energetic gentlemen inside the roomy, prosperous offices tell you what you can make of your life if you pull up stakes and come with them to the new lands. If England fails, she will be stripped of men, and will become a feminist nation. But she will not fail. The penalty is too severe.

It would be easy to play the rôle of a prophet here, and ride a radical gallop through the coming England. But I have consistently limited this outline to the tendencies already under way, to the currents already running. I have struck out the minimum of social remodeling, as recognized by middle-of-the-way publicists. I can quote "The Saturday Review" on a minimum wage for agricultural labor, "The Times" on the idea of national syndication, the Government on the "pigsty" in which the farm-laborer has been forced to live, and Mr. Asquith on woman's claim to a vote on the basis of her war work.

To suppose that these changes are going through gracefully is to dream in the daylight. They are coming jerkily, unevenly. Nothing

LABOR

will be granted except as it is forced. I have heard talk by persons in well-to-do homes about the new brotherhood of the trenches. One of the most distinguished English writers said to me:

“Do you think working-men will ever feel bitterly again, now that they have seen their officers leading them and dying for them?”

It did not occur to her to inquire how gallantry in an infantry charge would prove a substitute for a living wage. There will be brotherhood after the war if the privileged classes pay a living wage; but from what some of their representatives have said to me I gather that brotherhood is to be practised by the workers in ceasing to agitate for the basic conditions of a decent life.

Not much of this emancipation is being made in love. It has largely come by the clever use of force, and what it brings will be like the gains of war for territory—areas soaked with human tears, breeding-places of fresh dissension. The eternal questions will beat in again after the new order is established. Is a living wage the final answer to the homesickness of the human spirit? Does a materialistic conception of life satisfy the longing of the heart? Are the claims of beauty

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

met by uniform rows of neat little dwellings and by sanitary factories? Have we really crossed the great divide and arrived finally in the sunshine? One doubts it. The life of the spirit is not so easily satisfied. But as in the present war of arms political differences are buried, art and poetry forgotten, and all the national will focused on this one thing to do, so in this greater struggle the vast complexities of life are overlooked for the sake of a working program of action and a sharp summary. Happiness and morality, beauty and religion, are left to take care of themselves.

It is not from brotherly love that an increased coöperation between the directors and the workers is being established, but because without coöperation the production of wealth is lessened, capital is diminished, and wages are decreased. That coöperation is not secured by telling the laborer to "be good," to remember the nation, and to forget his wage. The capitalist of the past has been indifferent to the welfare of his workers. He has had his mind on individual profit, not on national wealth. If he acts in the future as he has in the past, extracting an immediate high

LABOR

profit at the expense of the worker, and therefore of the national wealth, the control will be taken from him, and will pass over automatically into the hands of the democracy. It rests with the capitalists themselves whether they and their system will survive or whether their function will be taken over by the industrial group and the state. Capital and labor are a permanent institution; but the capitalist, unlike the laborer, is by no means an indispensable unit in the institution. If the capitalist will handle himself in relation to his employees as the French officer does in relation to his men, he can postpone his extinction indefinitely. If he develops a democracy of spirit and attitude, taking less profits and paying higher wages, exercising leadership by intelligence and sympathy, and permitting labor a voice in working conditions, he will remain in partial control of a diminished realm for the immediate future at least. As fast as he fails he will be ousted.

Discipline and responsibility are the essentials for the new life just beginning, and they rest with equal weight on employer and employee. They are two words which had become unpopular in

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

our recent philosophy of life, because the qualities themselves were out of favor. But the war has revealed their ancient worth under the cake of modernism.

The faults of the English, as I see them, are an almost incorrigible mental torpidness, which is slow to see a new situation and obstinate to move even when seeing it; a deep-rooted belief in the class system; an unconscious arrogance; and a suppression of the emotional life. As the result of these limitations in insight and sympathy, the English race has been backward in the betterment of its own people. It has overworked and underpaid its own sons and daughters till a portion of its population rots in foul slums.

A silent, slow-moving, but determined will, a constancy of purpose, a standard of conduct, often fallen short of, but rather consistently aimed at, are, I think, the saving characteristics of English character. By reason of these virtues,—and they are supreme virtues,—when the English race starts to right a wrong, it goes through with the work to the end. It has now set itself to give justice to its workers. The social move-

LABOR

ment is more surely on its way in England than in any other country of Europe.

Human history has moved in cycles, and war has often marked the cesura. The French Revolution, the Napoleonic wars, and the invention of machinery altered the face of the world and refashioned its inner life. We are to-day in the presence of an industrial revolution as vast as that of a century ago. We in America shall be wise if we, like England, practise preparedness not only in the obvious surface requirements of dreadnoughts and citizen armies, but in the profound modifications of the social structure and consciousness.

THE DISCOVERY

Any one who looks forward to a peace on earth following the war of the trenches is going to be present at a surprise-party. The workers are gathering themselves for a mighty effort which will make the French railway strike and the English mine and transport strikes look like an afternoon tea. The issue will be precipitated when the Government and the employers fail to restore

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

the old trade-union rules and regulations. They cannot restore them because the conditions have changed in the last two years. New automatic machinery and the entrance of male and female semi-skilled workers have made it impossible to restore the old system, which was adapted to the old conditions. Let me quote from a careful investigation made by experts:

Many of the men who return from the trenches to the great munition and shipbuilding centers are, within a few weeks of their return, among those who exhibit most actively their discontent with present conditions. Among those who have fought in Flanders or who have been employed in making shells at home, there are many who look forward to a great social upheaval following the war. It is the testimony of responsible observers on the spot that some of our greatest industrial centers are even now in a state of incipient revolt. To a very large number of the men now in the ranks, the fight against Germany is a fight against "Prussianism," and the spirit of Prussianism represents to them only an extreme example of that to which they object in the industrial and social institutions of their own country. They regard the present struggle as closely connected with the campaign against capitalist and class-domination at home.

Unfortunately some of the results of the war itself,

LABOR

such as the Munitions Acts and the Compulsion Acts, have intensified this identification of external and internal “enemies.” We are not discussing the necessity of these measures. The point is that the working of these acts and the tribunals created under them has given rise to an amount of deep and widespread resentment which is the more dangerous because it is largely inarticulate. It is particularly dangerous because it tends to discredit in general working class opinion that section of labor which looks to the improvement of industrial conditions by negotiation or by legislative action, and to strengthen the hands of the party which preaches doctrines of wrecking and appropriation.

The war has not put an end to industrial unrest. Every one of the old causes of dispute remains, and others of a more serious nature have been added in the course of the war. The very moderation and unselfishness shown by the responsible leaders of organized labor are looked upon by important sections of their following as a betrayal of the cause and by some employers as a tactical opportunity.

What is the answer? No half-way solution, no artificial “faked” restoration, no “brotherhood of the trenches,” no turning of the attention of labor to “higher things” by a national mission, will suffice to meet the imperious demands of five

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

million men who have felt the rhythm and momentum of victorious organization. There is only one answer which will avail. That answer is democratic control. It can come in either of two ways. It can come by the graceful concession of the employing class. If it does not come in that way, it will come by the overwhelming force exerted by general limitation of output and by wide-spread strikes. And if these prove slow, then there is the possibility of what a Scotch employer recently declared. He said, "As I look into the future, I see nothing but bloodshed."

There is no need of bloodshed, which is a crude and unsatisfactory way of determining questions as complex as the division of profits, the limits of fatigue, the conditions of production.

Let us consider the principle of democratic control in detail. It is sensible, and industrial warfare is senseless, as senseless as international warfare. What is it exactly that the worker wishes? Shorter hours and higher wages? Yes. Better conditions of working and living? Yes. But all these are servants of a better thing yet—status. Status is standing. It is that position which a person or a class holds in society. The

LABOR

desire for status is the desire for a good life—a life raised above slavery and injustice, and free to develop its creative impulses. No one of intelligence wishes labor to thrust in and muddle matters which it has n't the executive equipment for handling. At its present stage of development labor cannot organize the market and sell the product. It cannot equip the factory and conduct the operating and selling conditions. Management in that sense is beyond its powers. Education, discipline, experience, the creation of a specialized kind of brain power—all are necessary to organize industry and conduct its multiple processes.

But what labor can manage and possesses the right to manage, but has not received the permission to manage, are the conditions of its own life—its working life and its leisure life. The installation of new processes, the introduction of new machinery, the injection of new workers—all these alterations of working conditions have been imposed upon the workers, as one puts a new harness on a horse, or shifts him from the plow to the tread-mill. The workers have built up their own system of protective devices to meet

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

these impositions of the oligarchy in control of them. They have limited the output by "going gently" with the work. They have limited the number of apprentices. They have practised sabotage and called strikes. They had no other weapons. The result of these protective devices has been to lessen the volume of production, to give capital a smaller return on its investment, and to cut down wages. The policy has been bad for employer and employee.

It is not altogether the control which capital and management exercise over the mechanism of production which creates industrial unrest. It is in part the control over labor. Absence of knowledge is the cause of some of the misunderstanding. The workers understand nothing of overhead charges, depreciation of plant, the risks of capital. They know nothing of the policy connected with buying and selling. The employers know nothing of the effect of a new process on the nervous system of the worker. They know nothing of the fatigue from overwork or monotony. They make no study of a standard of living. They go blindly ahead, as if men and machinery alike were tools to be manipulated.

LABOR

That an aim of industry should be a good life for the worker is an idea which would sound strangely in their ears.

What is needed between employer and worker is a pooling of knowledge, a frank exchange of the point of view, and a compromise in management. The way out is through democratic control over the conditions of work. The worker must be consulted when new machinery is installed. The effect of it must be studied in relation to monotony, fatigue, and danger. The profits from its introduction must be equitably divided between the employer and the worker. The consultation must not be a form of words. It must be a consultation where the voice of the worker is of equal authority with that of the executive management. The worker must be in a position to control the conditions of his putting forth of labor power. The new conditions, created by the new machine with its special processes, must be such that the balance of justice, established under the old conditions, is not disturbed by the alteration. The belief that every change, such as "scientific management," instituted by the employer, has enabled him to pick

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

up slack and take a tighter cinch-grip on labor, has led labor to resist labor-saving devices and modern methods of speeding-up. The employer has been partly defeated whenever he has played a "lone hand." And labor, in defeating him, has lessened the volume of production from which higher wages are derived.¹

¹ Consider the analysis Sir Hugh Bell has recently made of his own costs, as given in "The Round Table" for September, 1916.

"His firm makes steel, the raw materials for which are produced from his own coal and iron mines and limestone quarries. In every ton of steel made, 70 to 75 per cent. of the cost goes as the wages of labor. There remains 25 to 30 per cent. for all other outgoings, including profit. The turnover on a steel business in this country about equals the capital invested. If his profit amounts to 10 per cent., of which 3 per cent. at least must go back into the business to maintain the works, he thinks himself lucky, and the 7 per cent. left must cover interest on his capital as well as the profits for his enterprise and risk. The remaining 15 to 20 per cent. goes to cover rates and taxes, railway freights and so forth, part of which again goes to labor.

"Out of what fund," as Sir Hugh Bell asks, "is he to pay a 10 per cent. increase in wages?" If he paid 10 per cent. more, he would have no profit at all and could not continue the business. The increase in wages, then, can only come from within, by greater efficiency in management or greater production per man. There are, no doubt, many businesses which have some monopoly value, where capital secures a greater return; there are others where the return is less and the business is decaying. But except when abnormal conditions arise, as with shipping now, or when a monopoly or a patent exists, the picture given by Sir Hugh Bell is more or less applicable to industry in general.

No paper resolution, no legislation, and no economic theory can alter the facts of the industrial situation, but an adjustment and a gain can be made by a new release of productive energy on the

LABOR

What is the way out? Surely it is this: install the new machinery, establish scientific management, but explain the process, adjust the wage-scale, debate the problems of fatigue, monotony, and danger, safeguard the standard of living, study the new conditions, and work out an agreement between employer and workers.

Already there is a *rapprochement* between the larger groups. In the crisis of 1915, Mr. Tennant summoned the labor leaders to organize the forces of labor. The employers and the Government were helpless unless aided by the workers themselves. On that day, February 8, 1915, the principle of democratic control in industry was established in the modern state, never to be receded from. This system of joint committees had indeed long existed in the leading trades, where employers and union leaders met to settle disputes. But the white flag of truce was over the conference, while, outside, the battle raged. But Mr. Tennant by his bold measure raised the joint committee to the level of continuous mediation and consultation. These joint boards will part of the management and the men, by consultation between labor and capital, and by hard intellectual effort put on each detail of both the industrial process and the industrial relationship.

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

be the method by which the Government, the employer, and the worker will discuss the break-down during war-time of the trade-union rules, and the substitute to be given in place of an impossible restoration. The joint board is part of the machinery for reconstruction. The acceptance of it is an acceptance of the principle of democratic control.

That is the centralized and “parliamentary” side of the matter. But it deals with only half the problem. The other half is local government in the individual factory. No system of centralization can ever so extend itself as to deal adequately with the delicate various human material in the single factory. And for this a solution has been struck out. It is that of workshop councils, where the men sit in equal power with the management. It has been tried in a few places. It has worked excellently. There is one factory where no decision in several years has been appealed from. Disputes have died away. We shall hear much of “workshop councils” in the next five years. The experiment offers the one sane, peaceable way out of a struggle that, “unnegotiated,” will throw industry into chaos.

LABOR

Let us consider in detail what the workshop council will do. It will deal with the admission of unskilled workers into the factory, with piece-work prices, shop discipline, suspension and dismissal, welfare, organization, and production, "time" rules, consideration of complaints, methods of increasing efficiency, discussion of hours of work, and the necessity of periods of overtime, supervision of eating-halls, organization of recreation. The council will represent a department, and will send one representative for every fifty workers, for instance. Thus a department with 250 workmen will send five representatives. Sitting with the council in equal numbers will be the manager of the department and his assistants. For a large factory the departmental councils will meet and elect a "works council"—twenty-five workers and twenty-five managers and assistants,—who will consider matters touching the works as a whole. On questions such as fixing day wages and the level that governs piece wages, the employer will continue to deal direct with the trade-unions, but the piece rates themselves will be arranged by the workshop councils.

This is all experimental and tentative. It may

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

break down under bitterness or trickery. It may be manipulated by clever men. Chesterton, who is a hearty medievalist, desiring general peasant proprietorship, calls the scheme of "a certain proletarian representation in the employer's council" "the man-trap of the management." He says that "the first few labor representatives filtered cautiously into the 'management' will be beaten at the game. That is why they will be allowed to play at it."

Perhaps, but the idea is in line with democratic principle. It is being worked at by the best minds in England, and it offers the one peaceable way out of a strife that grows more intense every month.

The situation is this: labor is going to demand higher wages. To obtain them, labor must produce more goods, and the employer must improve his methods, install new machinery, and consult the worker. Some employers will meet the situation with superlatively good management —a management that will welcome the worker to a share in control, and will increase production and wages without financial loss. Some employers will make decreased profits, some will go

LABOR

to the wall, and some will fight the new conditions. If wisdom prevails on both sides, a new constitution of industry will be achieved.

DEMOCRATIC CONTROL

In this age, when psychology is taking over new realms of fact every year, it is increasingly difficult to use a phrase about society which is accurate in describing the instinctive life of forty-five million persons. Yet one must have a vocabulary in order to talk. The phrase "democratic control" appears throughout this book. By the principle of democratic control I mean the application to the institutions of property and the state of the sum of the desires and impulses of the persons composing the modern nation-state. Those desires and impulses are often thought about and definitely expressed in a reasoned program of action, as in the gradually developing "will to war" of the British people. Often they are held only in the subconscious mind, exploding through from time to time in blind action. But the desires and impulses of the mass people have to-day a power in shaping legislation, controlling administration, adapting environment, and estab-

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

lishing new social relationships, which, through lack of organization, they did not possess in earlier periods. Suppression, thwarting, submission are not acceptable to the people of a modern nation, and they have determined to live a more creative life.

“Democratic control” is a convenient phrase for describing what is taking place in society, which we express concretely by using the terms “labor movement,” “woman movement,” “welfare work,” “British commonwealth,” “rights of little nations.” An increasing number of people are seeing what they want and are getting it. An increasing number of women are desiring a living wage and the vote, and they are organizing their thought and will to obtain them. An increasing number of manual workers are wishing to control the conditions of their working life, and they are acting together in order to win that status. The dominions are growing restive under an imperial policy conducted by England alone, and they are preparing to take a hand in the shaping of that policy. These are instances of democratic control—the application to govern-

LABOR

ment and contract of the sum of the desires and impulses of millions of persons.

Our modern social movement, which is seeking to achieve the organized state under democratic control, operates through private ownership and individualism (property), coöperation, state control (socialism), and occupational association (syndicalism). The socialistic state has greatly extended its function in the present war. Non-local association, or syndicalism, is increasing its strength through workshop councils, joint boards, and the various organizations of common occupation, trade-unions, "industrial workers," gilds. Coöperation for production is powerful in Ireland, and coöperation for distribution has had a long and successful history in England. Property—the idea of the "small owner," the "peasant proprietor," one's right to one's "very own," is still intrenched. Any dogmatism on the claims of one of these against the others must to-day be rejected as not fitting the facts. Any prophecy as to which will contribute most decisively to the future organization of society is gratuitous. Each overlaps upon the others, but all are

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

expressions of the impulse toward freedom, and the social movement is the resultant.

Particular tendencies in the social movement cannot be exclusively identified with particular psychological dispositions. Dr. Graham Wallas writes to me:

The extension of democratic control is of course dependent on knowledge, or imagination, as well as impulse. More exactly, impulse in the modern world has to be stimulated rather by our ideas of what we cannot see or hear than by our direct sensations. The Railway Men's Union is growing stronger because individual railwaymen are getting a more definite conception of the capital- and state-machine instead of a vague acquiescence in a social order felt to be irresistible (or, rather, not felt to be resistible); because they have a conception of improving their position neither by individual industry nor by state action, but by syndical action; because they have learnt by experience that improvement can be brought about by syndical action.

There is not half enough concentrated thinking being done. The Labor party in its latest conference displayed as much hot feeling over infinitesimal details as the protagonists in an Irish election, and it dissolved without any large

LABOR

program. The speaker's Conference on Electoral Reform "approved" of the principle of woman suffrage, but failed to include a measure to obtain it in the resolutions. No synthetic plan of reconstruction is anywhere in sight. What will happen is that the pressure of necessity will force reforms, bill by bill, detail by detail. This is a costly way. It is the way in which shells were substituted for shrapnel. It means that each group in the community will fight like a lone wolf for its bone. It is possible that the engineering trades, for instance, which will come out on top during the first years of peace, will leave women and unskilled men to fight their own battles, failing to see that a standard of living and high production are principles established only by combined effort.

Each class division in the community is sulking in its corner and hugging half a dozen pet fallacies. The employer still believes that the aim of industry is a product rather than human welfare. He still believes in laissez-faire, "immutable laws of supply and demand," a servile wage class. The worker still regards "economic determinism" as governing the multitudinous

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

currents of human history. He still believes that there is only a certain fixed amount of work and money to be ladled out, a pool unfed by expanding production. He still believes in limiting the number of workers and circumscribing the areas and methods of production. He still distrusts the intellect as an instrument for establishing justice.

But the principle of democratic control forces its own way irresistibly through the storm of words and conflicting purposes. If only one man in England apprehended it, it would have to prevail, for it leads out of chaos. It abolishes ignorance and poverty. It releases the good-will which lies hidden and obstructed in our nature. It promises equality, and perhaps some day will bring in beauty to a troubled and unlovely world.

THE PIONEERS

England is becoming an industrial democracy, but the talk is all of speeding up production and making a better machine of the worker. The solutions of reconstruction necessitate a consideration of new automatic machines and subdivisions of repetitive processes. There is talk of a still

LABOR

hotter war of competition than in the old dreary factory days. All these discussions of the British Association and "The Round Table" and the Fabians and the government reports lean in the direction of Americanizing and Germanizing England. When you have made a good workman in that sense, you have n't made a good man at all. You have made a sharpened tool of production or a narrow, concentrated huckster. I feel in all this program something alien to the English nature. Half the fine virtues of a liberal life lie outside such competitive industrial requirements.

Once the question of "wages and hours" is settled, and that is only a detail of management which will be settled, we reach the heart of the problem. Can the curse be removed from machinery? Can joy be put into work? What of the jobs that are monotonous? Will they lessen in number?

The instant that joy enters into work the problems of overtime and fatigue disappear. Elasticity of spirit gives a swift recovery. Freedom to choose one's work, the right to arrange one's working conditions, skill in doing the task,

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

pride in the product—these are the elements that result in “joy in work,” are they not? What promise does the future give us that this quality of joy will enter into the work of the masses? An eight-hour day and a minimum wage of forty shillings a week do not help us here at all. Will the increasing control of working conditions by the workers themselves remove this curse of monotony, the grind of the machines on the human spirit? Will the fact of control alter the effect of the work, so that automatically it will pass from a condition of slavery to a condition of freedom? Will the worker, in exercising his will on the terms and conditions of his employment, find a full release for his powers, with the resulting sense of self-expression and its accompaniment of joy?

Or will the increasing control of working conditions by the workers result in a fundamental remodeling of the nature of the work itself? If so, in what forms will that change show itself? For instance, the happiest communities of the past were surely settled agricultural communities. Will the workers in part return to the land, rendered more fertile by modern methods of

LABOR

intensive agriculture? Will there be an era of noble building like that of the twelfth century? Will the modern democracy find it worth while to create beauty?

Then there remains the use of leisure. Are we to learn an art of living? Will creative activities be honored? Nothing is more striking in the last hundred years than the fact that the poet and the saint "do not count." They have lost control over the channels of power. The artist in any of the great forms has little influence to-day. It is easy to reply, "Let the great artist come, and we will listen"; but to produce great persons, the heart of the people must be turned that way. We are not quiet enough or responsive enough to form and nourish such growths. Not only are the masters of modern industry materialistic, but the workers are materialistic. The trade-union program, the socialist platform, the reforms of the social experts—all these center about matters of physical well-being and industrial efficiency. What has all this to do with outlook on life, the knowledge of true values, an understanding of the meaning and end of existence? Outlook on life is determined by the use of leisure—by the

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

pictures one sees, the music one hears, the books one reads, the talk one shares, the games one plays. The only education an adult receives, apart from that of the working-day, with its repetitive processes for most employees, is in the recreation of his leisure hours. School ends for most of the human race at fourteen years of age. The lives of modern workers are dark with drudgery for the working shift and spattered with cheap surface sensation in the hours of release. Fatigue and excitement march together through our city streets.

These are the two great questions of our time: Can the nature of work be ennobled? Can spiritual values be restored to modern life? For fifteen years these questions of what use shall be made of life under a true industrial democracy have seemed to me the most important, the least discussed questions of our day. Now that industrial democracy is arriving in England, I have put these questions to the leaders of public opinion. I have talked with Lloyd-George, experts of the Home Office, of the work councils, with John Burns, Seebohm Rowntree, Snowden, Button, MacDonald, Mallon, every type of mind in

LABOR

the industrial struggle. No one person is responsible for the conclusions which I give, but they seem to me a just summary of the best English opinion.

Will industry slide over into an old-fashioned balance between agriculture and factory labor? Can the curse be removed from machinery, so that the worker will find in his day's work some of the same lift and satisfaction which Gilbert K. Chesterton finds in writing books, who told me, "I have fun in writing my books"? These questions have been wrestled with since machinery came in. Hate of the machine was voiced by Ruskin and Morris. The hope of a new and simpler civilization has been stated by Edward Carpenter.

The answer is clear. The present tendencies of all the leading nations are altogether in this one direction of more productive power through machinery driven by skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled workers. Whether there is not a wholly different sort of life possible, with a simpler organization and richer values; whether the old England of hardy seamen and quiet farmers and yeomen was not a more admirable place

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

than the modern city, is to pose an academic question in the face of an obvious overwhelming tendency. All the nations are becoming Americanized and Germanized. The result is that a cheap, hasty product in unlimited quantity, a race for new markets, hustling and advertising are in command of modern life. All that is fragrant and choice and spacious in the older England is being caught into the whirl of these wheels. This tendency is summed up by two words: some call it progress, and some call it civilization. It is the judgment of experienced men that the mass of the people will never flock back to agriculture in an industrial country. England will not become more like Russia. On the contrary, Russia will become more like England. The machine is in permanent control of industrial life. New automatic appliances will be created; new subdivisions of process will be devised.

To offset this dead uniformity, there is the constant demand for new goods. No sooner has the manufacture of one article become standardized than the demand for something quite new arises. It is only after this has been manufactured for a considerable time on a large scale that its manu-

LABOR

factory becomes standardized. Meanwhile there is much skilled work in connection with it. But the percentage of highly skilled men who make the tools, install them, and direct this new process is small. There remains the vast and ever-increasing mass of semi-skilled workers who perform the endlessly repeated processes. The highly skilled man finds a measure of satisfaction in the exercise of his craft. A certain few machines have a delicacy of touch, and turn out a beautiful product, so that those who tend them receive a pleasure in superintending the operation. Seebohm Rowntree told me of a machine in his York factory which lays down three colors at one time on shiny paper, and does it with a finger manipulation which seems semi-human. The men in charge of this process thoroughly enjoy their silent partner. Work for them is not monotonous. But these workers of skill or happy processes are few in number compared with the millions in industry. For the great majority of workers there is little joy in their tasks or small pride in the products. The worker does not look on the *Mauretania* and say to himself, "I built her," because he tooled the rivets which went into

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

the engines, though that is exactly the thing which the workman did say eight centuries ago when he chiseled his masonic mark on the gray stone of the cathedral. To-day he seeks for an escape from the monotony of a weary process in other things than in the work itself. He regards machine labor as a drudgery. The series of motions is beginning to become standardized. Experts go through factories distributing cards that analyze the motions required to convert raw material into commodities. The worker is shown how to economize effort, how to make fewer strokes, and how to shorten the stroke, how to lessen the time of production from four hours to two hours and thirty-three minutes. This drift toward organization and mechanical efficiency will never be checked. It will gather momentum. The worker himself is often in favor of the automatic labor-saving machine if his standard of living is maintained and raised, as against the machine that calls for an exercise of skill. He prefers to save his vitality, his mental reserve forces, for his life outside the factory, for the creation of social values in his neighborhood and the furtherance of the causes that interest him.

LABOR

There is a clever and aggressive school of industrialists in England who will try to speed up industry without winning the coöperation of the worker. They will seek to install a scientific piece rate based on time study of factory operations, standardization of equipment, motion study of the actions of the worker in performing a piece of work, instruction-cards governing every bodily movement of every worker, and a set of "speeders-up"—speed boss, repair boss, shop disciplinarian. This Americanizing of industry does not look genial to the British workman. He will not accept it if it precedes the installation of work councils; that is, boards of control, in which he is represented. He will insist on his share in workshop control. He will obtain it. Then industrial organization will proceed along the inevitable lines of efficiency and scientific management. The further this tendency goes, the wider becomes the separation between the handful of skilled workers who shape the tools and set them up and the mass of unskilled workers directed by cards, routing, and scheduling.

There will be no return to a peaceful peasant folk. The dreams of Ruskin and William Mor-

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

ris must be laid aside. The mechanical processes of industry cannot be humanized; they can only be mitigated. The relations between employer and employed can be humanized; the Welfare Department of the Government is humanizing them. Individual employers have long struggled to humanize them; but this coöperation, this kindlier atmosphere, is itself only a mitigation of the conditions of work, and cannot alter the nature of the work. Not in the work itself, but in the creation of values outside the working shift, must the mass of people find their escape from monotony. As the worker receives his higher wage and his margin of leisure, he must by individual and collective enterprise lift himself from the machine-made mediocrity of our modern world. The worker will not become a man till after hours. A blessing can be wrung from the machine only on its own terms. It is a comfort, although a stern comfort, to know the direction in which we are going. Knowing that, we can govern the pace and better the road. Such is the answer on removing the curse from machinery.

What of the worker's conditions after hours?

LABOR

The solutions of almost all our social problems are already in operation locally in patches in parts of Europe. Denmark has solved one problem, Sweden another, and Belgium a third. It needs now experts to pool these solutions into a program and apply it wholesale. Transportation and housing lie at the heart of the problem of environment. Where the worker lives, and in what sort of home he lives, determine the conditions that surround him outside his working hours. State action here is necessary, and state action will be taken.

For two years prior to the outbreak of war a committee had been sitting to consider land and housing reform, and had brought in definite and far-reaching proposals. These proposals were being very seriously considered by the Government. It is probable that a bill covering many of the reforms suggested would have been introduced but for the war. There is every reason to believe that these reforms will come to the front as soon as the war is over. One of these measures deals with compulsory town-planning. Instead of building from thirty to forty houses to the acre, only thirteen will be allowed. This

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

means that every workman's house will have its decent privacy, its bit of garden. Another proposal is for a system of general transportation by means of light railways. Belgium has had about one hundred miles of light railways for every three and a half miles in England. This gives a network of cheap transportation covering the entire area around the great industrial centers. I used to ride into Ghent from Zele, from Melle, from every one of the smaller towns outside the city. Wherever I have stayed in Belgium, whether at Furnes, Dixmude, La Panne, Nieuport, or Ostend, the whole country-side was woven with tiny steam railways, carrying passengers for a few sous. This system gives easy transportation for the worker from his home in the suburb to his lathe in the factory. It means that he can live on a little land and, with his family, carry on light gardening, reducing his cost of living, with an occasional sale in the market. The combination of the two measures,—town-planning and cheap transportation,—applied to England, will end the slum by draining it dry, and by substituting a village community in pleasant surroundings. It means a gradual, but, in

LABOR

the end, complete, remaking of the environment for the workers. And an environmental change so vast will recreate the physical life of the nation.

These measures are nothing but simple primitive justice. They are merely animal rights. They do not deal with the basic spiritual needs of the community. Having won his emancipation from poverty and the serf conditions of industry, the worker must face the intellectual barrenness of his life. Through no fault of his own he is poorly fitted for the rôle he is now called on to play. He is uneducated, unimaginative, un-equipped to create the values in life which an industrial democracy will require in order to survive the dreary hours of monotonous machine work, however shortened and however highly paid, and the increased hours of leisure. Failing a solution for his overplus of vitality and for the unemployment of his higher faculties, he will be thrown back on rebellion as release for his unfunctioning energy.

The supreme need of English labor is wise leadership. That leadership will not allow this new energy, released by better wages and short-

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

ened hours, to spend itself in strife and rebellion. The tragedy of the labor movement has been that its leaders have often been sucked up by the Government, becoming official investigators, parliamentarians, committee-men. Or the skilled intelligent worker has passed over into the ranks of the employer. The succession of lost leaders has quenched the enthusiasm of the mass of the people, lessened their power of vision, and made them cynical of lifting themselves to a full, free life. If the shoulders of the people are used by their most vital representatives only to be climbed upon into positions of individual prestige, the people themselves will be little bettered by generating men of power. The labor leader must find his career inside his class. He must forego the easy advantages of a thousand-pound government salary. There are few wise leaders to-day inside the ranks of the workers.

As the result, the immediately practical next steps in the social revolution are clearly seen, but the creative readjustment that will make England into a free, liberal community is not seen. The worker is about to share control of his working conditions with the "management." His

LABOR

hours will be shortened, his wages will be increased,—the increase has already reached about one third of the industrial population,—he will have a voice in workshop conditions, his physical environment in his leisure hours will be ameliorated. His house will be situated in a decent community, with space around it for flowers and home gardening. Vocational training will be given to his children. This will come by a series of experimental measures, beginning with part-time employment in industry for those between the ages of fourteen and eighteen.

But a greater reconstruction than all this journeyman's work is needed. If the workers are able to develop leaders and to retain them, that leadership will concern itself in part with the cultural life of the people. There is no great future for labor except through education. The American film, the public house, the ha'penny newspaper, and professional foot-ball are not sufficient of themselves to make a new world. If English labor contents itself with gains in the mechanic and physical conditions of life, the form of solution will crystallize into its own kind of neo-Toryism. The same meaningless material-

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

ism will continue to sterilize and wither the minds of men. Now the minds of officials and experts, workers and employers, are malleable, now the national consciousness has been melted into hot and fluid form. Now is the time to shape and fuse that molten mass.

“We are going around to-day with a different brain under our cap from the brain we carried three years ago,” a leading official of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers said to me.

This is true of him and his fellow-workers, true of the politicians, and true of the employers. Before that brain cools to a new case-bound orthodoxy it must come to grips with larger principles of social reconstruction than any it has been dealing with in trade-union regulations. There is no discharge in this war. We need a new community, eager and unsatisfied, aiming after a nobility of life of which the modern world has had no vision. Let labor look to its task. Time presses. In five years England will have cooled down, and the impulse of the war, throwing old values into the furnace, will have spent itself. Men will reproduce the old world, with its barrenness of materialism, its hunt after cheap

LABOR

amusements, its immense mediocrity, its spiritual deadness, its nervous restlessness, its suppressions of vitality, and its explosions of rebellion, the same old round of dirty little intrigue, because there will be no great purpose to which life is directed, no creative dream of the people.

And in command of the community will be the same old gang of clever politicians feeding out materialistic catchwords of "Peace and prosperity," the adroit editors ministering to sensation as a substitute for creative activity. If the workers dodge and postpone this fundamental point in their emancipation, they will give us a world little better than the Victorian mess. They will give us something very like a prosperous American industrial city such as Detroit. The privileged class, with its neat formulæ of restricted education and established church, has long lost its control of the community. The brief reign of the captains of industry, contributing no ideas on ethics and social relationship, ended in August of 1914. Now comes the worker. Let him better the management of life. Patient, kindly, slow, very loyal to the man and the cause in which he believes, the English worker is the greatest

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

democratic force in the world. For our own salvation we must call on him to use his brain. He allowed the first industrial revolution to swing in on top of him in its meanest and most sordid form. Now that he takes control of the second industrial revolution, he must not try to compress humanity into narrower terms than those which the innumerable varieties of the human spirit have always demanded. The masters of industry tried this, and wrecked their world.

Into the forefront of their immediate program of action the workers must put the demand for an abolition of child labor and for the creation of a general, full-time elementary schooling up to the age of sixteen years. There must be secondary and continuation schools for all promising pupils up to the age of eighteen. There must be a larger number of universities, and a democratization of all the universities. The best men among the workers must be as thoroughly equipped in modern science, economies, and sociology as the governing class used to be in the humanities. The hope of an enlightened democracy lies in the general extension of state education and in the expansion of individual initiative

LABOR

in such experiments for adults as the Workers' Educational Association.

But the workers must insist that the education shall not be limited to vocational training, to science of research and application, to the imparting of facts. Education must give an interpretation of life. It must construct and impart a system of ethics fitted to our time. A living wage is no answer to such a tangle as that of sex; it is no answer to the concerns of empire and the treatment of the colored races. These are ethical matters, demanding hard thinking and new interpretations of old values. There are a dozen problems clamoring for an answer, and on no one of them is there an adequate body of recorded facts, with the tendencies deduced from them. Apparently, everything is to be solved by plunging boldly into activity and letting results come. What one feels the absence of in the labor movement is fundamental brain-work. Here are new processes being developed, new areas opened, a revolutionary shifting of the directive control of the modern world from the little historic group of captains to the vast army of the people themselves; and yet there is no realization that so

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

mighty a transfer of forces calls for a philosophy and ethics of its own. If the workers fail us in this, the patient old-time spirit will brush aside their little artificial structure like an empty shell and begin building again.

The whole range of moral problems has been left out of the reckoning. Changed conditions have resulted in an entire alteration of human relationship; but no one has stated the new ethics that will give guidance to the plain man's desire for a free, human, liberal life and for an answer to the meaning of life. The cry of Dostoyevsky still lifts itself in our night: "Surely I have n't suffered simply that I, my crimes, and my sufferings may manure the soil of the future harmony for somebody else. I want to be there when every one suddenly understands what it has all been for. All the religions of the world are built on this longing, and I am a believer."

What interpretation of modern life have we had? Not one. Frederick Taylor tells us to bind every thrust of the hand, every throb of the brain, into an iron scheme of regularity; Tolstoy tells us to jump out of the system altogether. But neither they nor our other literary and sci-

LABOR

tific prophets have faced all the facts resolutely and thought their way through to a synthesis. Neither peasant mysticism nor scientific management will put greatness into the lives that ninety out of every hundred obscure persons must live. We cannot hope for any saving word from the clever manipulators who cut the cost of production or from isolated artists, high above the combat. The word must come from the worker who, refusing to be factory-bound, turns from his machine after extracting a living wage and becomes an interpreter for his fellows. We wait for this word. It will be a word made flesh, and it will dwell among us. It will not utter itself in handicraft communities or on the lonely farm. It will neither flinch from the immutable economic basis of life nor try to feed the human spirit on applied science and novel devices of speeding-up alone. It will be a word of faith.

Modern essayists write retrospectively of the “age of faith” as if faith was possible only among naïve men in an age of mental darkness. But faith is the product of a vitality that is fully expressed. It has therefore always been the possession of vital and effectual men, and is found

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

alike in Cromwell and Walt Whitman. It is as inevitably the sanction of wholesome living as joy is the accompaniment and sanction of the creative impulse in love and art. It is not a blind belief in what is not true. Faith is the expression of a belief in life. The last century has been faithless not because it was dynamic and enlightened, but because it was darkened and weary. Democracy, with all its striving, has produced thus far only three men of genius, Mazzini, Lincoln, and Walt Whitman, and one of them said:

Give me, give him or her I love this quenchless faith.
Is it a dream?

Nay, but the lack of it the dream,
And failing it life's lore and wealth a dream,
And all the world a dream.

We moderns have side-stepped these fundamental questions of a spiritual basis for existence because they troubled our surface life. Meanwhile we heaped up the immeasurable inner forces of unanswered desires, unexpended spiritual vitality, and frustrated impulses until they finally came roaring through and overswept Europe.

There was a time when religion answered this

LABOR

need of the race for a vital expression. It still answers the need of a part of the community. There are liberal tendencies inside the church making for a faith which does not offend men's intellects and does not preach submission and renunciation. A small, but influential, group of workers still govern their lives by religious faith. But religion in any organized form, in any terms that are concrete and susceptible of measurement and analysis, has ceased to exist for the mass of the people. The old religious penalties and sanctions have been undermined by modern thought. Our new, vague social consciousness has failed as yet to develop any stringent system of ethics of its own, any code of relationship which is binding. In labor a class war, in sex a medieval suppression, were the extent of present-day vision up to the hour of the war. For many generations the life of spiritual aspiration has been starved. There is no longer any appeal made to it. Our development is altogether in the direction of a materialistic conception of life, by legislation to conquer poverty, by machinery to achieve happiness. It looks on organization as the sole method of progress, efficiency as the end

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

of being, science as answering all the needs of the human consciousness, and scientifically directed force as the final master of human affairs. It is not that the young or the poor go wrong, but that we all go wrong in our commercial civilization. We all live for sensation, for a visible standard of success in terms of sense-pleasures. To make life easy, to escape the old perils and hardships, the old disciplines and responsibilities, has become the chief aim of the modern community.

England must make imperious demands of the new democracy. We refuse to rest satisfied with their improved housing, easier transportation, better working conditions. These are only the means to worthy living. They do not deal with the business of living itself. If the workers of England can create a community that "looks good," the example will be irresistible, and civilization will respond to it in every nation. It is only in the creation of such communities, where the life of peace is a thing of joy, that we can look for the end of wars. But in their community they must find a place for the life of the spirit, for faith, for the finer values of nationality, for

LABOR

the rewards of merit, energy, and initiative. Because initiative in the old industrial serfdom only bound them the tighter to the management, they have practised “ca canny.” But when they take control, failure in initiative will cut the tap-root and spinal nerve of their productivity, their prosperity, and final well-being. They are called on for a wholly other set of qualities than those which they have developed under the stresses of wage conflict. Every situation now demands a different reaction from the one produced when a profiteering employer pulled the strings. Every new invention, every automatic machine, every shortened process, every device for directing muscular force that will cut the cost of production, is working for their benefit. But their newly used initiative must carry further than the workshop. It must wreak itself on the community, and devise a wisdom of life, fulfilling the inextinguishable longing of the human heart, which has gone unanswered in recent years till it found its answer in world war.

Unquestionably in the last fifty years the labor movement, reacting vigorously against the defenses of privilege projected, often unconsciously,

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

by organized religion and class education, has made a drive against the life of the mind and the life of the spirit. Itself a vital movement, fighting for freedom and justice, it has included among its enemies forces which are themselves the very source of freedom and justice. It has done this because these forces had created institutions, such as the established church and the great universities, which had lagged in the movement toward continuing emancipation. But labor cannot carry on a war with intelligence and spirituality without in the end being burned up by their fine violet ray. No philosophy of income will survive against the higher demands of the human spirit. Labor must be willing to work with these victorious forces, not against them. In scorning the free play of intellect in the realms of art and pure research, and in scorning the efforts of the spirit to find an interpretation of life leading to spiritual peace, the labor movement has hardened and strengthened the very materialism which is its own worst enemy. If labor holds that it is too busy with its immediate emancipation to trouble with "theoretical considerations," it will be in the position of an

LABOR

army which allows itself to be outflanked and surrounded because it is concentrated on a drive at the center. This is the gravest issue which labor faces. It has won its fight for a decent standard of living and for a measure of control in industry, but it will certainly lose the future if it continues to regard the writer, artist, and ethical teacher as parasites, and if it continues to see them as idlers who are living indolently on the hard work of better men. The labor movement is itself largely the product of a few thinkers, unconnected with organization, members of no party. It will destroy its own sources of supply and will become dried up if it discourages fresh liberations inside its own organism. Its one outlet into the future is its capacity for throwing out experiments in the creation of new varieties, like a plant. It must distrust its own orthodoxy and status quo, its own accepted formulæ and popular teachers, as it distrusts the utterances of bishops and class-bound captains of industry. Only so will it manifest a principle of vitality charged with unfailing impulses. Falling short in this, it will betray itself as only a single unrelated, short-lived impulse, clothing

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

itself in one more limited institution, which will become its tomb. The worker must not only tolerate radical interpretative thinking outside his own ranks; he must welcome it among his fellows. The initiative of his leisure hours must lead out into regions of which he has been shy and suspicious. He must develop his own teachers and prophets and artists. The men of Ghent had already done a little of this inside their coöperative community. The English worker must be as glad of his sculptor and his poet as he is of his labor leader. By the creative use of his leisure he will justify his control over the coming age. In place of smart revues and sentimental plays perhaps he will give us drama, which has been an unused literary form for three centuries, worthy of revival.

For one hundred years the world has been silent on the meaning of life. The masters were busy with their new devices to squeeze profits, and the workers were too heavy with their toil to think at all. But by these unseen moral compulsions, by the values we create, every free act of our life is governed. Everything we say and

LABOR

do is shot through with the color and accent of our conception of life.

If life is “playing the game,” what is the game, and what are the rules? If life consists in making good, what is the good we are making, and what is the method of the making? If life is noblesse oblige, who are the élite, and what is the nature of their obligation?

The Christian ethics, for instance, have never been tried. Do the workers intend to attempt them? Will they state them for us in modern terms? What precisely is our moral foundation to-day? What is the basis of our happiness and virtue?

The suppression of the human spirit, the soul,—that congeries of impulse, desires, and memories,—has gone on under the industrial revolution with its applied science, its emphasis on realism, and its mechanical detail. How faintly the life of industry has taken hold of the human spirit was revealed by the great burst of released force that broke through with the war. The nations had been gathering steam for several generations till they blew the lid off. All the time

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

that the hands were busy in repetitive processes the secret subconscious mind was generating its own forces. Suddenly men saw a release from modern life, an escape from the machine, and a substitute for the materialistic conception of existence, and seven nations went out with faith in their hearts. The workers themselves were among the first to go not because they were herded and conscripted, but because adventure and change and faith had returned to a very flat world. There came an almost universal exultation that at last there was something in which to believe, something impersonal and vast on which the primal forces of emotion could discharge themselves. The old industrial order received its sentence then; but unless the new industrial democracy wins for us a creative peace, it, too, is doomed. It must give us an interpretation of life which commends itself to our nobler faculties and not alone to our body needs, or men will again turn themselves to killing in order to escape the greensickness of materialistic peace.

LABOR

REASONABLE SATISFACTION

(No man in England has a better right to speak on the principles of reconstruction than A. E. Zimmern. He is known to all scholars as the author of that distinguished book, "The Greek Commonwealth." He is known to English labor as one of the promoters of the Workers' Educational Association. He has been a member of the Reconstruction Committee for the British Government. What he and his group believe is rather likely to influence the direction of tendency in the social movement, and some of their belief will probably be enacted into law. He has very courteously given me this statement of his views on the problems of "The Pioneers.")

My own view about the campaign for Germanizing England industrially is that it can't be done. The Englishman has a power of passive resistance equal to that of no one else in the world except it be the Turk. You can't drive him. German education would be impossible here because the English school-boy would not stand it. The same is true all round, and it is this tough and conservative individualism which has been the great obstacle to the swift adaptations which the war has made necessary. That being so, one is thrown back, when one looks for directions of reform, upon the alternative policy of making the workman think the work *worth while*. This brings one to the problem of "joy in work" and to the ideas and plans of Ruskin and Morris.

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

Ruskin and Morris were in many respects foolish medievalists, but I always think that in their insistence that the work itself, not wages or ownership or anything else, was the central problem, they were in the true English tradition. I think the future historian of the English working-class movement will regard it as a calamity that they never really converted the trade-union movement to take their ideas seriously and make them practical. Instead, the trade-unionists were gradually led astray (as Morris was, too) by the invasion of Marxian ideas from Germany, which has put the whole labor movement in a false position for a generation; for it has made the most independent section of the most individualistic people in the world profess the creed of Socialism without knowing what it is, with the odd result that the Independent Labor party, which introduced Socialism into the labor movement in the late eighties, is now engaged in the far more congenial task of combating state supremacy.

However, this is all a digression to explain why I think the time is ripe for a new orientation

LABOR

of labor thought on the lines of the Ruskin-Morris tradition.

I think the conception of “joy in work” needs careful analysis. I am sure that “interest” is n’t the real thing we must aim at. The craftsman’s joy in its pure form is rare, and the fruit of solitude and self-discipline. The English are not a race of artists. They are a race of practical, cheerful, sociable, industrious people with a high general average of ability. Such people do not aspire to joy; what they want is to get reasonable satisfaction out of their daily work, and the social atmosphere in which they work is perhaps the chief natural source of that satisfaction. That is why I believe that all these expedients of shop committees, etc., do really go far to touch the root of the matter.

There is another point, which I think is very important, and that is better arrangements regarding the choice of employment. I believe that if, without any other changes at all, you could simply put all misplaced square pegs into square holes and vice versa, you would do an enormous amount to increase “satisfaction.”

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

This is a problem of keeping the working-class child at school long enough to be able to discover its special bent, and then providing skilled vocational guidance. A lot of work has been done on these lines by Thorndike, Bloomfield, and others in the United States, and we could do vastly more here.

I think monotony should be met by regular arrangements for varying the job. There is a vast amount of experiment to be done on these lines. I expect you would find that the East-Enders who go hopping in Kent work all the better for it afterward.

Leisure, of course, is being dealt with by the Workers' Educational Association, but I think we are only at the beginning of the communal provision of leisure and of real education for the adult citizen. This is one of the main functions of a university in a modern community, and its buildings ought to be systematically used for such purposes in vacation time. In fact, the educational plant, like the factory plant, ought never to be idle.

This brings me to the poet and the artist. I have thought a good deal about their absence, be-

LABOR

cause I have the example of Athens constantly in my mind. I think the main reasons are two:

(1) That the modern world is too noisy and confused. We need absolutely to cultivate quiet. The telephone, for instance, is a devil's invention for heaving up delicate growths of thought by the roots. Most of our possible modern poets are journalists; that is, they never keep their poetry in till it is mature. This is specially true in the United States, which is a land overflowing with imagination and creative feeling, which hardly ever materializes in enduring literary forms.

(2) We lose a huge amount of our artistic and poetic material by our neglect of education in adolescence. The reasons why modern town life has not produced its Robert Burns is that the modern industrial system crushes men's spirit in adolescence and drives them to drink or worse, from which they emerge, if at all, incapable of the biggest work.

I don't think we can ever hope to reform our social system without the artist's help, because only the artists can give our industrial workers a *standard*. Democracy in industry is all very

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

well up to a point, but masons and bricklayers are no more qualified to design a house than navvies are to decide on how a bridge is to be built. The bridge will tumble and the house will be ugly. This is the fallacy of the arts and crafts movement, which seems to assume that hard work, creative energy, and joy can produce beauty. But beauty has laws as sure as the laws of dynamics, and only a combination of natural endowment and hard thinking can discover them. The artist is before all things a scholar. To be a painter or an architect is to be at school and to have a school, as the Italians knew. But scholars are rare. Let us find those we have, and honor them and listen to them; but do not let us flatter the workman by telling him he is equally competent to make their decisions, or that he can experience the same creative and reflective joy.

CHAPTER III

WOMEN

EMANCIPATION

TO-DAY women are facing the same hard fight for political recognition and industrial status that men faced one hundred years ago. They are taxed without being represented; they are worked without being properly paid. No phrase sums up the measure of their desires, for the desire to be free is larger than any policy, and creates its program in action. And with each gain the desire grows greater and more definite, and extends the program commensurate with its own sense of life. At no moment and at no point can it be codified, because it is under way. And this desire, propelling the woman's movement, is only one projection of a deep and potent instinct that is operating through men and women, through nations and classes. Already it has set Europe on fire. It may yet sweep the world. This impulse of creative force has

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

welled up from the depths of life and gone out in many directions. As nationality, it has stirred France and Poland and Croatia. It has seethed through the colonies and turned the empire into the British Commonwealth. It has touched the labor movement into a revolutionary force. I saw the drive at Ypres. I circled Verdun and heard those guns. I have seen three hundred thousand men massed in a small area, and the regiments of relief swinging up the dusty road. But I hear other marching feet than those, and I know that this war is a little thing compared with what the silent millions are soon to be doing to this old earth. The hammers of their reconstruction will make louder thunder than any of Picardy. The world is struggling to set itself free, and there has been no such stirring in a century. This movement toward freedom may be shackled and turned to base uses, like the forces liberated by the French Revolution; but the vigor and contagion of the movement are as yet beyond the control of any authority, and may achieve a great reconstruction before they die away.

This creative impulse the women of to-day

WOMEN

share with the miners of South Wales and the poets and peasants of Ireland. The "woman question" has been segregated as if it were a unique and unrelated problem which could be handled in a water-tight compartment. The purpose of the woman's movement, both trade-union and suffrage, is to integrate the "woman question" with the general movement toward democratic control. The charge has been made that women lack the capacity for organization, that they do not possess the native and instinctive cohesion that finds expression in trade-unions. The answer of their leaders is that absence of organization is a characteristic of unskilled, ill-paid, and casual labor, whether that labor is male or female. Where women have been admitted to skilled trades, as in the cotton industry, they have formed powerful unions and kept step with the men. Failure to organize is not a failure of sex. It is a matter of training, opportunity, and wages. As fast as skilled trades are thrown open, as fast as men's trade-unions unbolt the door, as fast as a living wage is paid, women respond with the same qualities of cohesion, the same faculty of organization, the

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

same understanding of the principle of democratic control, that men have revealed.

But to be granted this chance to display capacity for self-government in industry the vote is necessary. The vote is necessary because wages tend to slide down when the worker is impotent politically. The woman worker is unable to bring pressure on employers and the Government to enforce her demands. As an instance, the leaders point to the underpayment which has been given for over two years to many thousands of women in government-controlled establishments. Even in a period of high wages, women workers in large numbers have been existing on a weekly return of three or four dollars. A living wage is five dollars a week, and even that is severely low at the present prices. Granting the difference in cost of living between America and England, which is ceasing to be a wide difference, the recent decision of Massachusetts for a minimum wage of \$8.50 a week for the woman gives a better standard of living than the British Government minimum of a pound a week. To obtain such a minimum in the sweated industries

WOMEN

the women say they require the vote as a method of bringing pressure on the Government.

But they also say they must have the vote in order to win the full coöperation of the men's trade-unions. Actually, male labor will make a serious blunder if it excludes women from membership in trade-unions, because, in place of an ally, it will have an unwilling enemy who will inevitably beat down the wage-scale. But to make the men see the desirability of including women in the fight for the high standard of living, the women must come with political power in their hands. Without the vote, the men regard them as a multitude of claimants, doubling the cost of organization, doubling the number of workers, without contributing to the man's strength. As a matter of fact, it is to the interest of the male trade-unions to welcome women workers even if they remain unenfranchised. It is to their interest because, if women remain as a helot class, underpaid, unorganized, they will be used to scab the labor market. The men's trade-unions will be swamped by this new labor supply, unprotected and competing for

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

jobs. To save reconstruction from such mistakes, the women wish the vote so that they will be permitted to join male labor in the common fight. The reconstruction which is under way, much of it the blind operation of natural forces, some of it the careful program of industrial thinkers, will be incomplete if women are omitted from the trade-unions' councils and the parliamentary committees.

Great Britain and Germany were the two nations of the modern world where the male mind was in full control of the channels of influence before the war. That woman's fields of activity were church, children, and kitchen was believed in England as in Prussia. The average man thought woman a slightly inferior creature, politically incompetent, industrially incapable, mentally ill endowed. Unconsciously, he has wished to keep her in the ranks of an unrepresented, exploited, and casual-labor class. It has required an immense force of concentrated will, a wide-spread organization, and a constantly exerted pressure of what Mr. Lloyd-George calls "strident nagging" for woman to win the powerful, but now very delicately balanced, position

WOMEN

which she holds in the industrial world. She is seeking to win status. Status, or "standing," is that position which a person or a class holds because it is able to enforce its claims by political and economic power. Influence, whether silent, unconscious, or indirect, is non-existent except as the person or class possesses a measure of democratic control over the conditions of life.

This fight for recognition is in competent hands. Mary MacArthur, Maude Royden, Mrs. Fawcett, Mrs. Despard, Mrs. Pember Reeves, Mrs. Philip Snowden, Clara Collet, Mrs. Sidney Webb, Mrs. Bosanquet, Miss Atkinson, Sylvia Pankhurst, Eleanor Rathbone, Clementina Black, and a dozen more leaders are women of intelligence, sanity, and of much personal charm. They are making careful studies of industrial and social conditions. They are "next-step" reformers, basing their program of action on intensive investigation, analysis, and diagnosis.

The woman's movement is fighting a low-wage scale. It is fighting bad-shop conditions and bad-home conditions. It is concerned with woman as an industrial worker and as a mother. It has a program of reform that deals with

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

woman in each of her two capacities. It is fighting to free the narrow, suppressed middle-class woman, to give her a good life of self-expression. It is fighting to enable high-powered, well-educated women to count in the life of the community, to win for them fuller representation at the universities, a larger measure of influence in civil service and in government committees concerned with industrial conditions and community welfare. Suffrage and trade-unions are two of the instruments with which to achieve status through organization.

In a matter so vast and various as the woman's movement any positive statement of aim and direction is likely to be disputed. It would be impossible that the leaders should be committed to one single reform or set of measures. Each group apprehends a special need with intensity. What to get and how to get it are not seen single-eyed by these groups with the calm concentration of Tammany Hall. The catalogue of their names shows the variety of their activities: Women's Labor League, the National Federation of Women Workers, the Women's Trade-Union League, Women's Industrial

WOMEN

Council, Women's Coöperative Guild, the Women's Municipal Party, Catholic Women's League, and many more. And of suffrage societies there are the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies, the Women's Social and Political Union, the Conservative and Unionist Women's Franchise Association, the Women's Liberal Federation (and Forward Suffrage Union), the Catholic Women's Suffrage Society, the Women's Freedom League, the National Industrial and Professional Women's Suffrage Society, the New Union, the New Constitutional Society, the League of the Society of Friends, the People's Suffrage Federation, the Actresses' Franchise League, the Society of Women Graduates, the Women Writers' Suffrage League, the Younger Suffragists, the London Graduates' Union for Women's Suffrage, the Gymnastic Teachers' Suffrage Society, the Artists' League, the Suffrage Atelier, and many other organizations. In what follows I give only a massing together of personal impressions from talks with many women interested in the forward movement. I think that every one would ratify some part of the program. Probably none would

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

authorize the full program as embodying her own activity and desire. What I think the woman's movement of Great Britain is aiming at in their fight for status, which will be mainly waged through the instruments of trade-unions and suffrage, includes:

(1) Economic independence. To understand this, we have got to clear our talk of popular phrases. One of the portmanteau phrases of our day is that of "women going into industry." Women always were in industry till recently. Idle and unoccupied women were the exception in the older England. The Victorian Age in terms of human welfare was in this respect a reactionary age. The old-time industry of women was of course home industry. When most of the productive employments were lifted out of the home, women remained in the home, throwing a dead-weight on the productivity of the nation that it never before had to carry. The woman had always been a producer of clothing and food, and had shared the burden of requirements demanded by the household. Suddenly the man was left standing alone, with the weight of a wife and chil-

WOMEN

dren, sister and aunt, on his single powers of production. That very recent institution, the man-supported family, is a failure. It is a failure because the individual man alone cannot buy the food, the lodging, and the clothing which make the physical basis of a good life. Slum-dwelling, under-nourishment, and disease are the proof that the man has failed to carry the burden of several human beings on his single pair of shoulders. The immense numbers of unmarried men (over three million), the restriction of the birth-rate, are further proofs of the breakdown of that modern and bad institution, the man-supported family. The present well-being of hundreds of thousands of working-men's homes is due to the fact that one and two and even three women are now wage-earners who before "helped around the house." It is not alone that the wage to the individual man has gone up for perhaps one third of the working population; it is that multitudes of women are earning money to-day who before were unemployed. I found in the Du Cros factory, for instance, that the majority of the women were the wives and relatives of the men workers who had gone to war. In the old

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

days no one said, "A woman's proper place is the home," meaning by the home a retreat stripped of productive industry. The home meant a place of manufacture, where the woman shared with the man the burden of production.

The problem of the future is this: now that her work is at a geographical distance from her home, has she the vitality to carry on her activity at two widely separated points? It was simple to turn from the milking in the shed to the baby in the kitchen; but it is an unsolved problem how to rear a family in a side street and tend a lathe in the Woolwich Arsenal. War work for women has sharpened this problem. It is still an open question whether the excellent wage made by the young mother has been a sufficient offset to the fact of her absence from home. I have had testimony that the children under five years of age, left in the hands of relatives or friends, are better cared for because of the increased family budget. I have also had testimony that the actual care of the young child is not as good as when the mother is at home. With overtime and war strain, all former investigations would go to show that the

WOMEN

pressure of the last two and a half years on the organism of the woman will prove a permanent damage to the future of the race. The housing where large numbers have been shoveled together far from home is admittedly bad. The severe train journeys and the lack of moral oversight for the younger women are also admittedly bad. There is an immense amount of spade work to be done before we know even the factors in the woman question. We must study the full curve of the woman's life, her adolescence, the changing curve of wifehood and motherhood, the nervous reactions in relation to function. We have been generalizing on the "nature of woman" when we have only the slightest psychological basis. It is impossible to formulate a policy or even a program before we have a multitude of recorded observations. In place of these we are treated to large and noisy claims and vehement denials. Women en masse have done their best by going ahead and acting; but social students have not done their best, because they have joined the movement and swelled the volume of voices instead of extracting the data.

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

To return to the list of aims in the woman's movement. I think that women believe that better status will be obtained by

(2) Increased sociability. It is not alone for the economic reason that woman enters the industrial world in increasing numbers and, as in this war, joyfully exchanges the home and domestic service for the life of the factory. Industry is sociable. Its organization, the various contacts of relationship, answer a craving in her nature as in the man's. Life has become an increasingly friendly thing down the ages, and the lonely servant or housewife misses a fulfilment which even the underpaid shop girl finds. That the shop girl fails of values which the working-man's wife possesses is equally true. It is for the future to include both sets of values in the one life. In our overstress of economic determinism we are apt to forget that people do things because they wish to, as well as because they have to. So in all the maladjustments of women in industry we must remember that they are enjoying the conditions that surround the new work—the associations, the sociability—better than they enjoyed the isolated, unproductive home. To overstate

WOMEN

the injustice and suffering of the industrial situation shows a lack of perspective on human history. Comfort and well-being, the margin of leisure, the elements of happiness, are greater for the mass people than at any other period. A sullenness and despair have gone from the earth. The curse is being removed. Women are already sharing in this betterment, and they have recently elected the industrial world as a field of activity not because the factory process or the department-store detail offers in itself a worthier work than the care of children, but in part because the conditions surrounding the industrial world are freer and friendlier than the household conditions. There is an atmosphere of change and growth and sociability in paid work, and a freedom of hours when the work is done. There is probably small answer to many needs of woman's nature in clerical routine or mechanical process work in factory, office, and store. It is doubtless as sorry a thwarting of full self-expression for her as it is for the man. But she finds a partial answer to her needs, a partial expression, in the act of going out to a work of definitely assigned hours, of money payment, of

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

set periods of freedom and recreation, of association with a group of fellow-workers, and the wider opportunity for social intercourse on self-respecting terms with men.

And so we come to what I believe is implicit in the movement toward industrial work for women. I am sure that one reason why they do not care to remain half occupied in their own homes, and why the best of them scorn domestic service, is that they wish:

(3) A freedom of choice in selecting the mate—a freedom which was imperfectly granted to the woman in the restricted domestic area where she formerly passed her life. She has rejected the old policy of passive waiting while she played the rôle of dutiful daughter and older sister, culminating in the grayness of unselected “old maid,” the aunt and nurse of other people’s children. To obtain this freedom of choice she has stepped out into the wider arena of the industrial world. Between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five she is often not a determined worker in this field. She puts her spending money into attractive clothes and “a good time” as an investment in aiding her to select a mate.

WOMEN

(4) An equality in the home. As a wage-earner she can decree the terms of her position in the household. She becomes one of the two heads of the household, and ceases to be the unpaid housekeeper.

(5) Love. The deepest craving of her nature is to be loved. The old-time home did not fully meet this need, because love is based on equality, and she was not an equal.

(6) Intellectual and spiritual recognition. She wishes her mentality, the qualities of her being, to be understood by the man she loves and to be used in the life of the community. She has capacities for municipal housekeeping, for welfare legislation, for civil service, which will enrich the state.

(7) A community motherhood. A majority of women will find self-expression in the home, but there will always be large numbers who will turn to the outer world to express their mothering instinct. They will express it by nursing, school-teaching, reform movements, welfare work, and in the humanizing of industry.

(8) Career impulse. Increasing numbers of women find the same fullness of life in certain

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

forms of modern work that men find. They are developing directive capacity, accuracy, a mastery over large groups of facts and a power of generalization.

Finally, we come to the most fundamental of all the claims made by women. They wish:

(9) Birth-control. The modern woman wishes a final voice in the decision as to the number of her offspring. She refuses to place herself at the disposal of the man, to be used as he sees fit. Many feminists will angrily deny that this is a tendency of the woman's movement. Probably no leader will state openly that this tendency exists among modern women. But the vital statistics of the various countries establish the fact, and Great Britain, apart from the lowest elements of the population, has for forty years revealed a falling birth-rate. One can exempt many persons and many groups from the implication that they have furthered this tendency, and still be well inside what the facts show in stating that a powerful portion of the woman's movement, while not openly advocating birth-control, have nevertheless practised it, and that the emancipation of women is proceeding to the

WOMEN

accompaniment of a falling birth-rate. The unwillingness here to state the belief on which one acts is probably the last relic of the shame of sex which English and Americans share in equal measure.

The relationship of worker to master has passed through slavery, serfdom, and the wage-nexus up to free labor. The relationship of women and man has had no such sharp stages, marked by a time division. But woman has been, variously and sometimes in the single relationship, the instrument of household service, the instrument of pleasure, and the instrument of race procreation. In none of these relationships, as houri, squaw, or mother in Israel, has she been the free agent. Her position has been assigned her by man. The code of ethics governing her conduct has been created by what man thinks about her, and what he decrees she ought to be and to produce. He has assigned the limits, the conditions, and the kind of her activity. As she steps out into freedom, and, in particular, strikes a balance between her function as worker and citizen and her function of motherhood, she presents the community with this far-reaching prob-

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

lem of birth-control. In what is one of the few great books of this century, "Why Men Fight," I read:

Very large numbers of women, when they are sufficiently free to think for themselves, do not desire to have children, or at most desire one child in order not to miss the experience which a child brings. There are women who are intelligent and active-minded who resent the slavery to the body which is involved in having children. There are ambitious women, who desire a career which leaves no time for children. There are women who love pleasure and gaiety, and women who love the admiration of men; such women will at least postpone child-bearing until their youth is past. All these classes of women are rapidly becoming more numerous, and it may be safely assumed that their numbers will continue to increase for many years to come.

It is too soon to judge with any confidence as to the effects of women's freedom upon private life and upon the life of the nation. But I think it is not too soon to see that it will be profoundly different from the effect expected by the pioneers of the women's movement. Men have invented, and women in the past have often accepted, a theory that women are the guardians of the race, that their life centers in motherhood, that all their instincts and desires are directed, consciously or unconsciously, to this end. Tolstoy's *Natacha* illustrates this theory: she is charming, gay, liable to

WOMEN

passion, until she is married; then she becomes merely a virtuous mother, without any mental life. This result has Tolstoy's entire approval. It must be admitted that it is very desirable from the point of view of the nation, whatever we may think of it in relation to private life. It must also be admitted that it is probably common among women who are physically vigorous and not highly civilized. But in countries like France and England it is becoming increasingly rare. More and more women find motherhood unsatisfying, not what their needs demand. And more and more there comes to be a conflict between their personal development and the future of the community.

The diminution of numbers, in all likelihood, will rectify itself in time through the elimination of those characteristics which at present lead to a small birth-rate. Men and women who can still believe the Catholic faith will have a biological advantage; gradually a race will grow up which will be impervious to all the assaults of reason, and will believe imperturbably that limitation of families leads to hell-fire. Women who have mental interests, who care about art or literature or politics, who desire a career or who value their liberty, will gradually grow rarer, and be more and more replaced by a placid maternal type which has no interests outside the home and no dislike of the burden of motherhood. This result, which ages of masculine domination have vainly striven to achieve, is likely to be the final outcome of women's emancipation and of their attempt

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

to enter upon a wider sphere than that to which the jealousy of men confined them in the past.

On the other hand, in a recent talk which I had with Havelock Ellis he expressed himself as wholly in favor of the birth-control movement. He believes it will tend to do away with war and poverty. He spoke with approval of the publicity campaign carried on in America by Mrs. Sanger, and he showed me a copy of a little magazine of birth-control, issued in Cleveland, Ohio. In his latest book, "Essays in War-Time," he writes:

It used to be thought that small families were immoral. We now begin to see that it was the large families of old which were immoral. Quality rather than quantity is the racial ideal now set before us.

He speaks of the evil Russian factory conditions as "the natural and inevitable result of a high birth-rate in an era of expanding industrialism. Here is the goal of unrestricted reproduction, the same among men as among herrings. This is the ideal of those persons, whether they know it or not, who in their criminal rashness would dare to arrest that fall in the birth-rate which is now beginning to spread its beneficent influence in every civilized land."

He sees birth-control as a natural process, with

WOMEN

laws that underlie the voluntary and deliberate factors. "To improve the environment is to check reproduction," so that birth-control becomes part of the entire forward movement of the race. "Those who desire a high birth-rate are desiring, whether they know it or not, the increase of poverty, ignorance, and wretchedness." All this concerns the nation within itself. With the international aspect of birth-control, which is the heart of the problem, the next chapter deals. We are confronted here by the most significant tendency in modern civilization. As yet we are meeting it with silence or with rhetoric, with a Mosaic morality or a callous cynicism; but of patient study there is little. The modern woman has precipitated upon us many problems,—"dilution" of labor, and union rules, and all the rest,—but no other problem so searching, so fundamental, as that of birth-control. The correct solution will be determinative of the future of the race, the nation, and the world.

Like every other living and growing thing, the woman's movement will continue to puzzle us, and we shall catch up with it only to find it has swung out far ahead and over a wider area.

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

THE FEMINISTS OF THE WAR OFFICE AND ADMIRALTY

The War Office and the Admiralty are proving themselves in this war daring innovators of radicalism. They will be ranked in the future alongside of the syndicalists and the state socialists as initiators of a new social order. They have accepted the “new morality” of the most advanced school of Ellen Key, and have enacted it into legislation. What they have done is to concede the claims of “sex agitators” and grant an endowment for maternity to the women of Great Britain. They have not paused at orthodox motherhood, sanctioned by court and church, but in their impetuous feminism they have legitimized unions without the benefit of clergy, and are caring for unmarried wives and mothers. They have made the advanced program of the woman’s movement their own, and have swallowed whole the scouts, cavalry fringe, and lonely outposts of sex radicalism. The British people had largely confined the woman’s question to a suffrage and trade-union movement, a political movement. They had fought shy of the sex im-

WOMEN

plications (maternity endowment, unmarried motherhood) upon which certain advanced thinkers in Germany and the Scandinavian countries had long been insistent. But at one bold stroke the audacious pioneers of the army and navy have opened the full question, and brushed aside the reserve and timidity which Britons, like Americans, manifest in the presence of procreation. The result is a scheme as amazing as if Kitchener and Havelock Ellis had worked in genial collaboration. Militarism in England has proved a powerful dynamic for democratic control. It has bettered the status of labor, and it has created the new British commonwealth of five self-governing democracies. The longer it is on top, the more equality it generates among its conscripts. But nothing it has done is so subversive of the old order as this endowment of maternity. Into what fresh fields of liberalism the staff-officers and sea-lords will break during the coming months no observer will now dare predict.

Eleanor Rathbone, the famous town councilor of Liverpool, says of these military and naval feminists:

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

In the system of separation allowances they have been conducting what is, in effect, the greatest experiment that the world has ever seen in the State endowment of maternity. At the outbreak of the present war separation allowances were promised, first to the wives and children, and afterwards, in succession, to all other classes of dependents of both soldiers and sailors. The scale is sufficient at least to place the large majority of dependents of soldiers and sailors in as good or better a position financially than that which they occupied before the war. The separation allowance is the possession of the wife and not of the husband, and cannot be drawn by him even with her consent. Thus, the allowance has, in fact (whatever the intention of the Government may have been), two characteristics which we should expect to find in a system of State endowment of maternity, viz.: it is a statutory payment to a woman in respect of her functions as wife and mother, and it is proportionate in amount to the number of her children.

What really matters is not that the greater part of the upper, middle, and upper working-classes restrict their families, but that the strata below them, including the whole slum population, practise no such restriction. They multiply quite freely, and public health authorities combine with private benevolence to do just enough to keep the babies so born alive, but not enough to make them healthy. Hence, we are, as a nation, recruiting the national stock in increasing

WOMEN

proportions from the lower and least desirable elements in the population. The first advantage of separation allowances is, then, that it removes the temptation to undue restriction of families from those far-seeing and cautious parents who now practise it, and that it gives to the younger members of large families a better chance of healthy maintenance than they have ever had before.

It will be interesting to see how these women will take it when the war is over and they are asked to go back to their old status of dependency. I confess to hoping that the seeds of "divine discontent" will have been implanted in them too deeply to be eradicated, and that we feminists will then find our opportunity. The economic soundness of the State endowment of maternity has always appealed to me, even more strongly, if possible than its humanitarian and eugenic advantages. Many people do not seem even to have grasped the elementary truth that the work of bearing and rearing the rising generation is the occupation of all occupations that is most absolutely essential to the existence of the State. The women who are engaged in this occupation have to be maintained, and so have their children until they are of an age to keep themselves. The money that this costs has to come from somewhere.

These separation allowances are the first serious attempt made by the Government to deal

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

with the question of population, the most fundamental question which the nation faces. If half a million of the young men are killed or hopelessly incapacitated by this war, the resources of the country are diminished beyond repair unless a method of replenishment is instituted. Our past method of allowing the slum population to multiply, and forcing our better-class workers to restrict their families, is national suicide. English thought is almost silent on this question of whence the next generation is to come when the number of the fathers is lessened. There is a buzz of talk on tillage, cattle-raising, fertility of soil, but of how to get the human product there is little said. Bertrand Russell says:

It seems unquestionable that if our economic system and our moral standards remain unchanged, there will be, in the next two or three generations, a rapid change for the worse in the character of the population in all civilized countries, and an actual diminution of numbers in the most civilized.

There is reason to fear in the future three bad results: first, an absolute decline in the numbers of English, French, and Germans; secondly, as a consequence of this decline, their subjugation by less civilized races and the extinction of their tradition; thirdly,

WOMEN

a revival of their numbers on a much lower plane of civilization, after generations of selection of those who have neither intelligence nor foresight. If this result is to be avoided, the present unfortunate selectiveness of the birth-rate must be somehow stopped.

The problem is one which applies to the whole Western civilization. There is no difficulty in discovering a theoretical solution, but there is great difficulty in persuading men to adopt a solution in practice, because the effects to be feared are not immediate, and the subject is one upon which people are not in the habit of using their reason. If a rational solution is ever adopted, the cause will probably be international rivalry. It is obvious that if one state, say Germany, adopted a rational means of dealing with the matter, it would acquire an enormous advantage over other states unless they did likewise. After the war it is possible that population questions will attract more attention than they did before, and it is likely that they will be studied from the point of view of international rivalry. This motive, unlike reason and humanity, is perhaps strong enough to overcome men's objections to a scientific treatment of the birth-rate.

Havelock Ellis suggests the extension of birth-control to the lowest elements in the population, so that the ignorant and diseased and feeble-minded will not breed out of proportion to the

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

rest of the community. But birth-control alone, even when generally applied inside a nation instead of being applied as now only to the intelligent and wholesome elements, does not meet the international situation, which is one where the militaristic and autocratic nations, like Germany, Russia, and Japan, go on multiplying, and so altering the balance of power. Two wars have revealed that a stable population, like the French, no matter what its national well-being and its courage, is not in itself powerful enough to resist the invasion of a military nation superior in numbers. A generally applied birth-control does not meet the actual situation of an ever-expanding Slav race, with the yellow races in the near background and the early future in world arrangements. We cannot rely on an eternal world peace to permit us to reduce the populations of the democracies.

If England becomes a nation of a permanent, balanced, static civilization of forty million persons, that gives the future to prolific races, and the liberal democratic experiment is doomed. In America we are going this way blindly. Our old stock is practising birth restriction and is pass-

WOMEN

ing out of existence. We have hidden from ourselves the perils and ultimate disaster of this process by importing fresh hordes of vital peasants from southern and southeastern Europe; but the process is working to the extinction of the old America, and it is substituting different races, of alien blood and belief. A control of our life is being exercised by other races, and in a few generations we shall have an America as distinct from Puritan New England and the Cavalier South as Dublin is different from Manchester. Immigration is the easy and fatal solution for a lessening stock in America, but it is no answer for England. Englishmen will never let themselves be drowned out by tides of Sicilians, Slovaks, and Russian Jews. The future of England rests on whether its women are mothers, and whether those mothers and their children are well provided for. All other problems of reconstruction are derivative as compared with the creation of life and the establishment of a healthy and numerous child population. Lowering the death-rate by good milk and sanitation and housing and medical care is only a partial cure for a falling birth-rate. And saying, "Let women

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

work in the factories and professions and be mothers at the same time" does not meet the fact that the factory and the home are separate places.

"More and better children" is obviously the only solution for a Western democracy in a world where neighboring nations are not under democratic control. So we are forced back to some such answer as that of the feminist movement, led by the War Office and the Admiralty. Do not penalize by poverty the woman who gives sons and daughters to the state; endow motherhood. Population is a community and state concern. A nationalized motherhood is of more importance than nationalized railways. The military authorities have blazed the way by a reckless disregard of laissez-faire and conventional morality. They have laid down the principle of state guardianship for the profession of motherhood. It now rests with the common sense of England—a common sense reinforced by the instinct of self-preservation—to refuse to permit the great experiment of the War Office and the Admiralty to die away.

WOMEN

BOWING THEM OUT

The women of England, having received the thanks of a grateful kingdom, are now about to be rushed to the door and kicked down-stairs. They will be considered unmannerly if they do not pick themselves up from the door-step and disappear unostentatiously into the night. The process of accelerating them into their place is already under way. The speaker's committee on the franchise has reported, with a careful evasion of woman suffrage. The British bar has just voted down the admission of "duly qualified women to the profession" by an overwhelming majority. The sober sense of the members came to voice in the orator who was able to speak for "a good many members of the bar serving with the colors. They had the first claim to say to what extent the old tradition which confined admission to the bar to the male sex should be maintained. To take such a decision in their absence would be unjust to them."

The man at the front is being worked overtime in these days. He has to stand duty in wet trenches, and then the ghostly projection of him

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

is yanked back to elderly gatherings in London to protest against alterations in the ancient way of doing things.

So woman's fight for recognition reaches its third campaign. In the days before the war there was a dead-weight of opposition, made up of ignorance, distrust of change, and sex scorn. Then came the need of woman's help in five hundred processes of industry, in medicine, and organization. If girls made shells, steered delivery-wagons, conducted hospitals, served on the police force, managed business, and adjusted industrial disputes, there was little cogency in saying that women could not do man's work. As one of the women who helped to pull England through said: "Before the war women were only the mothers of men. Now they had risen to the dizzy heights of the makers of machine-guns." The tide was with them, and every wind that blew filled their sails.

Now comes the third and bitterest phase of the long fight. "Thank you kindly, but it is time for you to go." Bad years are ahead for the women of England. But let no one worry unduly. They have come to stay, and they will obtain the

WOMEN

vote. During the transition period, when the shell factories are becoming industrial plants, when the returning soldiers will have first call on the jobs, when the men's trade-unions are making up their minds whether women are their allies or their enemies, and when Parliament is deciding whether its ancient, solitary reign will be molested by these energetic new-comers, the female semi-skilled workers will have a severe experience. The unskilled workers will have the same sordid experience they have always had. This period of transition may extend through several years. Gradually the creation of new industries, making use of the new automatic machinery introduced under war pressure, will again offer jobs to the demobilized women. Winning the suffrage, women will have the power to enforce their demands for proper payment, and as voters they will suddenly become welcome additions to the male trade-unions, and together they will continue the fight for a high standard of living for both men and women.

About eight hundred thousand women have recently entered industry, transport, commerce, government employment, and agriculture. Five

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

hundred thousand of these are busy in munition-making. This increase came from five classes: first, more than one hundred thousand came from domestic servants; second, from the ranks of outdoor workers and small employers; third, from women remaining in industry after marriage and to a later age, and girls fresh from school; fourth, married women, widows, former dependents, returning to employment; fifth, middle-class women, society women, entering industry and commerce.

Many of these women will return to the home at the close of the war, but a large percentage have come to stay. All these have replaced the man in semi-skilled and unskilled work, one woman for one man. This is direct substitution. Indirect substitution is found when woman takes the place of an unskilled or a semi-skilled man who in turn takes the place of a fully skilled man. Group substitution is when a group of women takes the place of a smaller group of men, and substitution by rearrangement when women, plus automatic machinery, do work previously requiring skilled workers. The introduction of women

WOMEN

by these methods of substitution is virtually general throughout the trades.

In mechanical engineering, in "controlled" firms, the money wages received on piece-work are far above those earned by women before the war. Ten dollars a week is rather common, and instances of thirteen dollar a week day-rates are known. By a series of orders a minimum wage of a pound a week for forty-eight hours has gradually been established.

In the cotton trade, boot-and-shoe industry, bleaching and dyeing, woolen and worsted, china and earthenware industries, and tailoring, wages have been much bettered during the war.

The same care in substitution has not been made in agriculture, in biscuit and bread, rubber works, confectionery and sweets. The woman's wage here has tended to increase during the war, but probably not to equal the man's rate.

Summing up, the substitution of women for men has increased the money wage for women. In trades with definite agreements the women's rates approximate the men's. Where there has been no agreement, the women's wage has been

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

better than before the war, but is still far too low.

Of women in women's work, in the fuse and powder trades, as the result of arbitration, a gain has been made. In electrical engineering and telephone work, except for certain cases, the rate has changed but little. Why has woman won a decided advance in mechanical engineering and not in electrical engineering? The answer is that she is organized in mechanical engineering. Skilled groups of women workers in the power-machine trade have won real advances. In sugar confectionery, tailoring, and shirt-making a fair advance has been made. But all three trades are closely related to war work. Where the woman's trade organization has been strong she has obtained a decided rise in wages, whether she has been doing women's work or substitution work in men's jobs. But the bulk of women's industries have not kept step with the increased cost of living, nor has substitution for men necessarily obtained the man's full rate. Munition-workers have obtained a fair minimum promised them by the Government exactly in so far as their organizations have enforced the promise.

It is clear, then, that it is possible at any time

WOMEN

to obtain a decided advance in women's wages, including sweated industries. This advance will be obtained when, and not until when, the trade-union movement enforces it. The trade-union movement will probably not enforce it until women have the vote.

For two and a half years women industrial workers as a class have had more money than ever before. What has been done with it? It has gone into milk for the children, meat for a few meals a week instead of once a week, heat in the rooms, a clean blouse for the little girl, a picture-show for all the children. It has gone into war savings. It has purchased status, that most precious of all things. Money buys self-respect and a sense of well-being. For the first time in the life of many of these women they have not been obliged to go under-nourished, a little pinched, a little chilly, dressed in a garb that stamps them of the lower class. They have put off the faded shawl, the dreary blouse, the discolored straw hat, the boots with sagging heels, and the heavy-threaded stockings, thick at the ankles. Is it anything but good that some of them have rented a piano for the home, and now

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

have a bit of fun and music in crowded rooms? I have a friend who has oversight of some thousands of these workers. He told me of a girl who bought three suits of silk underwear at thirty-seven shillings a suit. It is nice to feel well-dressed from the skin out, when all the days of one's youth one has been in the uniform of the poor.

But he told me another thing. When one of the workers died of consumption, he sold 223 tickets at sixpence, a shilling, and half a crown each among the other workers for the widow and two children. Every week has its benefit for some family of the shop. Every week, with an open hand, the workers pay out their money for concert or theatrical entertainment to make a fund for people in trouble. For hundreds of thousands of these women the years of war have brought the first free spending money they have ever known, and there is something appealing, if we knew it, in the history of every shilling they have spent.

The war has introduced grave dangers to the health of women by night work; overtime; hot atmospheric conditions such as occur in certain

WOMEN

processes in woolen textile; severe muscular action, as in the lifting of heavy weights; and by poisoning, as in some of the processes in shell-filling. In munition work there has been a nervous strain connected with certain of the processes and the dangers of fire and explosion. In addition, a few factories are in Zeppelin areas, and on a telephone warning all lights go out, and the women lie flat on the floor till the danger is past. When the word comes to them to rise, one or two in a department are found in a faint.

To offset this, the Government has made the most determined effort in the history of any public institution to enforce proper conditions of work, to fight against overtime, to establish cleanliness, sanitation, and nourishment. The welfare department, under the ministry of munitions, conducted by perhaps the best known social worker in the English-speaking world, Seebohm Rowntree, has literally labored day and night to guard the girls and women of Great Britain. It has sought to preserve five hundred thousand women from results of war pressure which would have been disastrous. As a peace measure, welfare work is still an open question

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

when conducted by private enterprise unless it is clearly an addition to a living wage and not a clever substitute for it. But as a government measure in a time of the severest crisis in the history of the world it deserves nothing but praise.

Of the eight hundred thousand women who have transferred themselves into new work, how many are going to stay? No one knows. An organization to combine women in certain trades sent out recently a form of questions with the inquiry, "Do you wish after the war to return to your former work or to stay in what you are doing now?" Of three thousand answers, twenty-five hundred replied that they wished to remain in the new work. That is, five sixths. On the other hand, an investigator who has made a study of social conditions among the Coventry workers tells me that the majority of the women say they will leave industry and take up home life after the war. Some of them are married women who are now making the family income while the husband is at the front. Others are upper-class women who are "filling in" from patriotic motives for the duration of the war only. Others

WOMEN

are girls with their "boys" at the front. The young man will return from the war "fed up" with the life of a "stag camp," keenly desirous of a home and a family. Each locality, then, has to be studied, for each offers its own set of conditions. But out of the mêlée we can see several hundred thousand women, new-comers in the trades of men, remaining. We must remember that the old work no longer is open to them to the same extent as in the days before the war. It is probable that some of the luxury trades have ceased forever. Common sense, taxation, and the organized state will probably not permit the old-time expenditure on millinery, ball-dresses, and fancy sweets. Domestic service will not again suck up one million and three quarters women. The house that kept twenty-four servants will keep ten, the family that had three will "do" with one. There is no direction for women to go but forward.

Will there be work for them? No one knows. Coventry has already received orders for 1918, and it is probable that industry there will run on at full capacity for a year or two at least after the war. In Sheffield the employers plan a

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

swift conversion to the trades of peace. The great steel firms anticipate an undiminished demand for their produce. What made shells will be turned into railway supplies, for instance. Already they have orders that guarantee the immediate future—orders from Great Britain and Russia. They state that they will continue the women at work and will at the same time fit in the men. But such a report is unusual.

There are men's trade-unions, as in the instance of the transport-workers, who stood by the job until the women received the same rate of pay that they possessed. One or two other men's unions have promised to make the same fight after the war for the women. But these instances of rendering the work of reconstruction easy are unique, and the women must probably make their own fight, unaided by the Government, by the men's trade-unions, and by the employers. Unorganized and unenfranchised, they will be the center of unrest and suffering, a running sore in industry, imperiling the standard of living established by the men's organizations, scabbing wages, and weakening the trade-union movement. With votes and wide-spread unions,

WOMEN

they would become a vital element in the emancipation.

What women face at the end of the war is the chaos into which they fell at the beginning of the war, when over a million and a half of employed women were thrown out of work or placed on short time. With the coming of peace the semi-skilled women will be demobilized from the munitions factories and dumped upon the labor market. At the same time two and a half million men will leave war trades and flood the labor market. And the army will be demobilized. Much of the new machinery created for war needs will be available for the industries of peace; but the period of transition will be long, because the plant must be adjusted to the new requirements, markets for the product developed, and capital found. It may be two years, it may be five years, before what has been a shell factory becomes an engineering plant, turning out an equal volume of production. During the time in which the business is finding itself the women workers are going to be the last class in the labor market to be considered. The old skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled workers returning from the army,

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

the men munition-workers, the partly wounded soldiers, will have prior consideration. They will be safeguarded by a carefully wrought scheme of demobilization, by a properly adjusted unemployment insurance, by a pension system. It rests with the women, by agitation and pressure, to establish for themselves a standard of living, and to hold fast to the undoubted immense gains they have made during the war.

The task is probably not one primarily of creating work. The rebuilding of Belgium and northern France, the deterioration of plant in Great Britain, the closer industrial association of England with her colonies, the needs of Russia—all these give promise of a stimulated market for British products. The task is one of organization, devising a machinery for connecting the worker with the job, safeguarding unemployment, and maintaining the standard of living. The new minister of labor is arranging to breathe life into the sleepy institution of labor exchanges, and to add eight hundred to the number. The Government has offered the extension of compulsory unemployment insurance. This meets only the needs of some of the war workers and

WOMEN

meets those needs only in part. Seven shillings a week amounts to poor relief, and does not reconstruct the industrial situation of the total group.

Certain of the women leaders have suggested a wide-spread unemployment insurance which shall preserve the standard of living; an analysis of the market as to where workers will be required, with the distribution of such information through trade-unions and employment exchanges; and a supply of blank forms to be filled up by the workers desiring future employment; due notice of dismissal to be given by "controlled" establishments, and return railway fares to be paid to those workers who have come from a distance; and the use of government factories for a continuing national work. Further, they have suggested a system of training in new trades for women displaced from work. Such is the immediate program.

But back of it lies a deeper need. The suggestion has been made for a minimum wage. This could well be made part of the general policy, which was already beginning to be formulated before the war for a minimum wage in agri-

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

culture and the underpaid men's trades. Experts had agreed before the war that the primary condition to be met was that, with the least possible delay, all workers of normal ability should receive as an absolute minimum a reasonable living wage. By this is meant a wage which will enable an adult man to maintain a family of normal size in a state of physical efficiency, and which will allow a margin for recreation. With the prices of July, 1914, this was twenty-seven shillings a week, allowing five shillings for rent. With present prices this has become thirty-six shillings. But to establish a minimum of thirty-six shillings a week at one stroke is impracticable; so the present demand is for a minimum of thirty shillings. The minimum suggested for a woman was sixteen shillings before the war. It is now a pound a week (the rate gradually established by the Government in munition factories). Some of the experts ruled out the suggestion that a woman should be paid as a minimum enough to maintain a family. They argued that minimum wages should be arranged with a view to normal conditions, and though there are many exceptions, the normal condition is for man to main-

WOMEN

tain a family and for a woman not to do so. This contention will of course be disputed by many feminists on the showing of the facts. But what is clear in the matter is that there is a rapidly increasing tendency toward a minimum wage, and that a minimum-wage act must include women.

Other measures of reconstruction are being pressed by the leaders of working-women. Investigation is needed as to what employments are hurtful to a woman's organism. Reform of the factory laws is included in the changes that are now seen to be required. The eight-hour day must be enforced. President Wilson by his decision in the railway strike has enforced a principle to which the trade-unions all over the world must respond. Women officials are required in greatly increased numbers to safeguard the position of women in industry. Not only must the number of women factory inspectors be increased, but it may prove to be necessary that members of the new profession of welfare workers in factories shall be appointed by the state rather than paid for by the employer, and the new labor ministry must have among its under-secre-

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

taries a representation of women. The trade-unions must grant admission to women in return for monetary contributions, and the women must have a measure of control of the machinery of the union. The children who by means of a special certificate have leaked into industry must be returned to school. This at one sweep would relieve the labor market of one hundred and eighty thousand persons in industry and agriculture. It is probable that all these reforms are dependent on the winning of the suffrage.

DISORGANIZATION

The chaos out of which woman's work is slowly emerging will be revealed by a modern instance better than by tons of generalization. I have asked a young woman of excellent middle-class family, now financially pinched, to make a chart of her recent life-history. Better than any "wail" it shows the cul-de-sac of the old "genteel" occupations. It explains why she has turned to clerical work in the War Office, paying a salary of twenty-seven shillings a week. It shows why she will not return to the old job after the war. Like a few hundred thousand other women, she

WOMEN

has entered organized life determined to stay. Employers, the state, and trade-unions must reckon with her. Her chapter of dreary episode is followed by a chapter in sharp contrast on the policewomen, who have inserted organization into a muddled community. The two chapters together are the concrete demonstration of the economic and social disturbance which has precipitated women into the central activities of the community.

My friend's position was that of "lady help," the kind of work which is "woman's work," and has the approval of anti-feminists and other reactionary theorists. I have preserved her arrangement and phrasing.

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

COMPANION HELP IN BOARDING-HOUSE AT ST. LEONARDS

£20 (\$100) salary a year.

1 shilling, weekly laundry.

Tips, gloves, flowers, or sweets.

6:30 A.M. Rise.

7:00 Dust dining-room and drawing-room, water and wash all plants, arrange flower-vases and put out all dessert, make servants' and own bed, tidy own bedroom.

9:00 Pour out all coffee and tea and cocoa, help with serving breakfast.

10:00 Make all single beds, help maid with double ones (about twenty-two bedrooms, two houses adjoining). Dust all bedrooms, superintend maid with all upstairs work and turning out of rooms, give out all linen, see to sorting same.

12:00 M. Mend all torn linen, interview guests for rooms.

1:00 P.M. Help serve lunch, give out and check all beer and stout sold.

2:00 till 4:00. Free to go out or rest.

4:00 Cut up all cakes for tea, and hand round tea with maid in drawing-room.

5:30 Mending.

6:30 Time allowed myself to change for dinner.

7:00 Serve soup, vegetables, and sweets.

8:00 Entertain in drawing-room, singing and accompanying songs, arrange card-tables, talk to gentlemen in smoking-room.

11:00 Put out all lights in both houses, then allowed to go to bed.

WOMEN

LADY HELP AT RECTORY, WITH SIX IN FAMILY AND NO SERVANT

£18 (\$90) salary a year.
1 shilling, laundry weekly.

6:00 A.M. Rise.

6:30 Clean big kitchen range, clean two sitting-room grates, sweep two big rooms, and dust.

9:00 Cook breakfast (hot), lay cloth, serve, clear away.

10:00 Make beds with lady, empty toilets, sweep and dust four bedrooms.

11:00 Cook and prepare hot lunch, wash all vegetables, just dug out of garden, clean windows inside which needed doing, clean silver and brass in sitting-rooms, clean door-step every other day.

12:00 M. Tidy up kitchen before lunch, wash over kitchen with mop, also scullery (stone floors), wash hearth.

12:30 P.M. Lay lunch and serve.

1:30 Clear lunch away and wash up, lady helping to dry up.

2:15 Time allowed to tidy up and have rest.

3:45 Get tea for four, clear away, and wash up.

6:00 Bathe and put little boy to bed, get supper for same and his little brother.

7:00 Prepare hot supper for four.

8:00 Serve supper, clear away, and wash up.

9:00 Put hot bottles in four bedrooms.

9:30 Finished work; could go to bed if I liked.

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

LADY HELP AT HOUSE, WHERE NO SERVANT IS KEPT

Five in family, parents, one little girl of five, twins ten weeks old,
in delicate health.

£12 (\$60) salary a year.

6:30 A.M. Rise.

7:00 Make and take up early tea to bedroom, dress little girl.

8:30 Sweep dining-room, dust, and lay cloth.

9:00 Look after twins through breakfast, have mine as best could, also attend little girl.

10:00 Help both twins get ready, make beds, dust and sweep four bedrooms, empty toilets, tidy bathroom, take all three children out, babies in pram (perambulator).

12:30 P.M. Bring children home, make bottles, lay luncheon on cloth.

1:00 Look after three children at lunch.

3:00 Take three children out, have entire charge of three.

4:00 Get tea, make bottles, take children out for short time, do shopping.

6:00 Put babies and little girl to bed, give them bottles.

7:00 Get supper and lay cloth, clear away and wash up, listen to babies the rest of the evening, make their bottles.

11:00 Could go to bed. Had one twin in my room all night, had to attend to it and make bottles every two hours through the night; baby slept very badly.

WOMEN

LADY HELP AT PRIVATE HOUSE AT BLACKHEATH,
WITH PARENTS AND TWO CHILDREN,
NO SERVANTS

£20 (\$100) salary a year.

6:00 A.M. Rise.

6:30 Take up early morning tea, sweep dining-room and hall, clean kitchen, light fire, clean grate, cook hot breakfast, light copper on Mondays, and fill same.

8:30 Serve breakfast.

9:30 Clear breakfast and wash up.

10:00 Empty toilets, dust stairs and landing and bath-room, sweep and dust four bedrooms, dust drawing-room.

11:00 Take children out to do shopping.

12:00 M. Prepare and cook hot lunch, make puddings for hot supper.

1:00 P.M. Serve lunch, lay cloth, clear away, wash up, and make tea.

3:00 Time allowed to tidy and wash myself.

3:45 Get tea, clear away and wash up, ironing to be done.

6:00 Take children for walk, get their supper.

7:30 Cook supper, lay cloth, and wash up.

9:00 Work finished, go to bed.

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

LADY HELP AT HOTEL IN LONDON

£26 (\$130) salary a year.
1 shilling, laundry weekly.

7:00 A.M. Rise.

7:30 Dust dining-room, drawing-room and hall, see to flower-vases, help maid carry up all breakfasts from basement to dining-room, varying in number, clear in between, and keep tables quite tidy and freshly laid.

10:30 Go up-stairs with maid, make all beds by myself, fill jugs, tidy bathroom, dust and sweep ten bedrooms.

12:20 P.M. Tidy for lunch, help maid lay luncheon cloth, carry up some trays.

1:00 P.M. Wait on guests at lunch.

2:00 Clear away lunch and wash silver, knives, and glass.

3:00 Mend torn linen, answer front door-bell, shopping.

4:00 Lay and get tea, usually two meals of tea at different times, then mend linen until six o'clock.

6:30 Help maid lay dinner-cloth.

7:00 Bring each separate course from kitchen up-stairs, wait on guests in dining-room.

8:00 Wash up silver, knives, and glass.

8:45 Finished; go home.

WOMEN

LADY HELP AT LADIES' HOSTEL FOR WAR WORKERS,
DAILY COOK KEPT

£18 (\$90) salary a year.

6:00 A.M. Rise.

6:30 Fill big tea oven, make ready morning tea, lay breakfast for eighteen, cut up four plates of bread and butter.

7:30 First breakfast for seven.

8:30 Rest, have breakfast, serve and wait on every one, hand cups round.

9:30 Empty all toilets, fill all jugs in fifteen bedrooms, cubicles mostly, sweep and dust bedrooms, sweep stairs (four flights).

12.00 M. Lay luncheon-cloths.

1:00 P.M. Serve luncheon and wait on twenty people.

2:00 Clear away luncheon.

3:00 Wash up silver, glass, and knives.

3:20 Time allowed for rest and to tidy myself.

4:00 Get tea for seven people.

5:30 Wash up tea-things.

6:00 Lay cloth for twenty for evening meal; meal lasts till 9 P.M.

9:00 Wash up.

10:00 Go to bed.

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

LADY WAITRESS AT ARMY PAY OFFICERS' MESS

Ten shillings salary a week. Had to pay four shillings a week for bedroom out of it; only to work from Monday to Friday.

9:00 A.M. Help the cook prepare all puddings, rub bread-crumbs, chop suet, etc., peel all vegetables, three or four different sorts.

11:30 Put up several big hospital tables, arrange all chairs, etc., carry down everything for cloth from kitchen down a yard, with no protection from rain or snow, to a hall let for the purpose.

1:00 P.M. Carry down all courses for hot lunch, clear away everything, back again to kitchen, wait on officers at lunch.

3:00 Sweep hall and cloak-room, remove everything from hall, take down tables, sweep kitchen and passage, help cook with all the washing up.

6:00 Usually finished; pay breaks.

WOMEN

TEMPORARY HELP AT A LODGING-HOUSE AT BRIGHTON, WHERE MAID IS KEPT

Seven shillings sixpence (\$1.80) weekly and tips.

6:30 A.M. Rise.

7:00 Take up early tea for five people, hot water to carry up for seven or eight, sweep two big sitting-rooms, and dust, lay breakfast-cloths in both rooms (different floors).

9:00 Take up breakfast for seven people in one room and ten in the other. Get breakfast for staff and take in.

10:00 Clear away breakfasts, make beds with lady, empty all toilets, sweep and dust seven or eight bedrooms.

12:15 P.M. Lay cloths in both sitting-rooms, carry up lunch, clear away in between.

2:00 Wash up silver, knives, and glass.

3:00 Time allowed to wash and tidy.

3:45 Get tea for both sitting-rooms, also staff's tea, wash up, and clear away.

6:00 Take up hot water to bedrooms, turn down all beds, empty toilets, and fill jugs.

7:00 Lay cloths for supper, clear away, and wash up silver knives and forks.

10:00 Finished; go to bed.

Seven shilling and sixpence, and "finished; go to bed"—the Woman's Movement is in those words.

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

ENGLAND'S POLICEWOMEN

Long before the war the women had proved their case, but the door remained bolted. It was the war that broke down the door, and let a rush of women through into industries and professions. In a few months they altered the consciousness of England and won their spiritual freedom. The vote, industrial equality, control of their life, will inevitably follow. There are five hundred thousand of them making shells. An entire military hospital has been placed in their control and under their exclusive management—doctors, surgeons, orderlies, messengers, superintendents. That was done by the War Office, which has never been a rash or radical innovator in England. The War Office is now issuing requests for women doctors. It finds them as steady in emergency, as delicate in nice manipulation, as their brothers. The old cant about physiological barriers has been broken down by the pressure of a million casualties. Women are driving heavy trucks, running elevators and trams, even managing places of business, including a bank.

WOMEN

As yet it is in large part the same millions of women who were earning wages before the war that have taken possession of the new activities. Probably not more than five hundred thousand women have stepped over from idleness into the day's work. But half a million is a large increase, and that half-million are only the vanguard of the army that will be conscripted by England's need of every adult for increased production. The significance of the change does not lie as yet in the number of previously unemployed women who have entered wage-earning occupations. The significance lies in the new professions and the processes of industry which they have taken over. It lies in the work once closed to them, which is now opened for all time. A measure of freedom has been won that never existed before. Their right to play a part in the industrial and professional world had been challenged. Their presence in the modern economic world had been resented. Inside of two years woman has ceased to be a question, and has become an accepted fact.

It is a mistake to think that the hundreds of thousands of women who are helping to carry on

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

industry while the young men fight were organized and engineered by new-comers, that a spontaneous uprising took place. The women who led the new movement into hospitals, munitions, the tram-cars, and the police were the seasoned executive women who had long been successful wage-earning workers in nursing and school teaching, women who had long fought for social reform in labor conditions, housing, and the care of children. The amazing alteration in the economic position of women in England is not the work of amateurs. It is the sudden ripening of an immensely laborious, painfully slow growth.

Opponents of the woman's movement have watched with a keen eye for a disintegration of the home resulting from the entrance of numbers of "home" women into munition factories. Neglected children, shoddily dressed and poorly fed, were what they feared to find. The showing has been all the other way. The reports from Woolwich, for instance, show that the school-children are better nourished and better clothed than in the days when the mother was a hack in the home over a wash-tub. A wage to a mother of £2.10

WOMEN

has not wrecked the British lower-class household, but has improved it.

Radicals have played the same part in the woman's movement that they have played in the labor movement. It is not that the mass agrees with them or likes them or follows them; but they have clarified and given a coherence to vague subconscious desires of an inarticulate community. They have presented a sharply etched program to a blind urge. Their program is:

Votes for women.

Economic equality.

An open field in the industrial world.

Those clear-cut demands give the movement a coherence, a cutting edge. But those demands are not the woman's movement. They are merely the instruments with which it can work its will. When it has received its instruments, it will then proceed to do its work.

To change the figure, it is easy to see the portion of the iceberg that is above the water and visibly heaving down upon our man-made, man-favoring institutions. But seven eighths of the mass is below the surface. The genius of the

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

woman's movement lies deeply submerged under surface revolt, economic injustice, and resentment at man's unconscious scorn for the female mentality. The genius of the woman's movement lies in the imperious demands of her nature for worthy expression. Industry, like the suffrage, is a means by which she achieves her personal freedom and equality. It is a spiritual condition which she is seeking, not alone a new activity. Fame and money are not the supreme incentives to her that they are to man. For that reason her entrance into politics and work offers the promise of a humanized industry and a better state.

My own personal impression in the first half-year of the war was that the women were quicker to get a start on than the men. There was almost a scramble on the part of women of leisure to volunteer for relief work. The women solved the problem of Belgian refugees by taking them into their homes, by organizing village colonies for them, by finding them work. In those early months I attended many dozens of recruiting meetings. I found that two of the most popular speakers were Mrs. Drummond (the "General")

WOMEN

and Mrs. Pankhurst, leaders of the suffrage movement. A group of women saw the war in its meaning to Great Britain, the costliness of waging it, the immensity of the effort which would have to be put forth, long before the general public opinion of England was awakened.

Women have revealed adaptability in their war work. They have swung swiftly to meet new conditions and solve unexpected situations. A good instance of the service they have done England is that of their organization of a police force. War conditions had created certain perils to the community. The absence of the father away at the front is not a benefit to the children at home. Boys were running wild and thieving. Other boys were being overworked. Immense numbers of men on leave in great cities are a menace to the well-being of excitable girls. War creates its own atmosphere, and there were both a looseness and a tension, strange combination, in the life of khaki-clad England. A group of women saw the peril and had a remedy. Led by Miss Allen and Miss Damer Dawson, they formed the Women Police Service in August of 1914. There were half a dozen of them. The

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

members have grown to three hundred, and they are now serving not only London, but Grantham, Bath, Hull, Folkestone, Wimbledon, and Richmond. Their duties are patrolling, attendance at police courts, home visiting, supervision of music-halls, cinemas, public dance-halls, and inspection of lodging-houses. They take the depositions of children and women, watch the parks, stations, and docks, meet Belgian refugees. At certain munition factories they keep the women's gate, searching the women, and permitting no stranger to enter.

Their uniform is a blue military tunic, divided skirt, riding-breeches, riding-bowlers, and top-boots. The chiefs wear peaked caps. Their organization is one of chief officer, superintendents, inspectors, clerical staff, sergeants, and constables.

When they made their start, fifty of them were drilled by a sergeant of police in a back yard of the suburb of Hornsey. The first town they worked in officially had a diocese of twenty-five thousand inhabitants and thirty thousand soldiers. Their work from the beginning has been more preventive than repressive. They handle

WOMEN

trouble before it becomes a court case as well as after. They suggest solutions.

Commandant Damer Dawson, the chief officer, speaking of Leicester Square, the very heart of the night life of London, said:

Take, for instance, Leicester Square. You hear people say that Leicester Square is infested by "night hawks" and bullies and so forth, and that it is also infested by abominable women. No abuse has been spared. It has been poured upon the women who make a trade and living out of immorality, but very few have said a word about the other sex, which is bound to be connected with the life of the London streets. One might think that there are only two classes of people on the London streets, the police and the prostitutes, and that the rest are innocent people. However, it is not for me to give you a lecture on the state of the London streets, except inasmuch as it touches our police work and our experiences night after night.

We find that things have very much changed since the war began, and are changing very quickly. Therefore you can not possibly write to the papers or argue about any social condition which existed even a few months ago. You must go straight to the streets night after night and follow up cases as you find them; and this is what you find. There are bullies there, both men and women bullies, but not to the same extent that

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

there used to be, for this reason: you have to deal with modern women on the streets, and you will find that the temptations thrown before these young women from the time that they are "flappers" is enormous. Mind you, they are light-hearted, aching for excitement, and they are non-moral. That is the result of social conditions. They have no moral training; their parents give them none, and they have very little at school, and they have very little religious enthusiasm. Therefore they come out into the world non-moral. Nevertheless, they are exceedingly human, and determined to have a good time at all costs. They are mostly girls who have tasted the bitterness of life, girls among the five millions for whom there may not be a husband, and therefore they have got to make their own living.

Then there come thousands of men, with hundreds and thousands in money to spend, and the young women pay the price. Do you think they know the price, nine out of ten of them, the disease and the misery that are going to ensue? Of course they do not know.

The policewomen are able to touch a certain fringe of this work. None of us can claim anything more; but we are able to act as a tremendous deterrent. In the first place, certain streets which we patrol at nights we are able to keep absolutely clear. Young officers, boys of seventeen and eighteen, who have hardly left their mothers, are taken to these streets by women who ought to know better; but when they see the police-

WOMEN

women they bolt. Ours is only patchwork, but it is a help. In a great many cases we are able to get hold of the young girls and to save them. Young girls and young men get to know us, and we move them on. The very fact that a policewoman is in the street acts as a potent moral shame to what is going on.

I was very struck with an illustration of this which occurred the other day.

"Are they friends of yours?" said a policewoman to a couple of young fellows who had taken hold of two girls.

"How dare you!" said one of the men, quite furious.
"Of course I know them; they are cousins."

"I am the wife of an officer," said the policewoman,
"and as you are an officer wearing the king's uniform
I take your word for it."

Ten minutes later the young officer overtook her and said, "They were not my cousins, and I thought you would like to know I am going home."

Any person of experience reading that knows that Miss Dawson and her co-workers have a broader and more fundamental knowledge of our modern social problems than the average male policeman. The only police method in dealing with the "social evil" has been that of repression and harrying, interwoven with graft, and it has n't advanced us any in the direction of a solution.

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

Take another instance. A serious fight was taking place between two drunken soldiers who should have been in camp. The men had taken off their coats to fight. The policewomen cleared the crowd, separated the fighters, persuaded them to put on their coats, shake hands, and return to camp. The old orthodox police method for such a fracas was a clubbing. The only test of a method is, Does it work? The new women's way works. Success has been their answer to tradition.

These new women officers have cut their way through red tape and obtained the right to act decisively and promptly. The military authorities have given them the right of entry into houses in certain restricted districts, so that they can take hold of a situation before a rumpus sets in. The policewomen observed a drunken soldier enter a house which they knew to be occupied by a woman whose husband had just left for the front. This house had been previously suspected by them. They fetched the military picket, who came at once to the house, and with some difficulty forced an entrance. The soldier was caught and arrested. Several children found in

WOMEN

the house in a dirty and diseased condition were taken care of by the policewomen and handed over to the inspector. Before the picket could enter, the woman escaped by means of a trap-door which connected with three other houses.

These peace patrols have dug themselves into the community. One of them is a probation officer. The police use her to interview women who are being "summoned." There was an entire city street in a row, like one of our before-the-war Southern vendettas. Half the street had summoned the other half to court. The policewoman marched the whole street back home, and settled the case out of court.

A constant protective watch is kept over the lives of children. From time to time reports have reached the policewomen of young children of school age working excessive hours during the school week. It was decided to approach the head-masters of several schools who welcomed help in the matter and promised detailed reports. In one district they found twenty-four paper-boys with hours varying from $7\frac{1}{2}$ to 25 per school week. The beginning hour in the morning seems to be from 6 to 6:30 A. M., so that the majority

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

of these children will be working without proper attention to food and habits. Many may go to school without any regular breakfast. Of these, two are eight years old, one getting up at six o'clock, the other at 6:30 A. M.; one of them working $12\frac{1}{2}$ hours, the other $7\frac{1}{2}$ hours.

Twenty-two boys take milk around. Their ages vary from 8 to 13, their hours from $7\frac{1}{2}$ to $12\frac{1}{2}$ per school week, beginning work from 4:30 to 6 o'clock A. M. One boy of 8 works 20 hours a week beginning at 4:30 A. M. Two boys, 13, house-boys, work $7\frac{1}{2}$ hours. Two boys work in coal-yards; one is 13 and works 19 hours per school week, beginning at 8 A. M.; the other boy, aged 11, helps his father, and works 5 hours per school week.

The question of child-labor presents itself as one of the root problems of the hour for local as well as for national authorities. The police-women see some of the results of boy fatigue and malnutrition in the listless, uninterested young people standing and loitering about, ready to follow after any new excitement.

There are towns where no by-laws exist regulating the employment of children under

WOMEN

fourteen. The question has been before the education authorities for many years, and the enforcing of certain drafted by-laws is likely to remain in *status quo* owing to war conditions. Employers prefer children to elderly labor, and many parents regard their offspring as financial assets. The work of these women guardians will result in a better protection of child life, because they have exposed the evil conditions. The policewoman is an official mother. She does not use physical violence. She talks with the boys about gambling and smoking and thieving. She warns the girls. There are no fixed posts. Often she covers an area of two and a half miles, as in the borough of Paddington.

War has let loose the high spirits of boys, and some of them, with the added stimulus of American films, have taken to the life of pirates. London streets are a tumbling sea of adventure, where grocers' carts are the helpless frigates to be manned and pillaged. The new women "cops" pull the boys off the carts, and advise them to let the tea and jam travel on unmolested.

This strange excitement of war touches the imagination till it sees placid planets as the prod-

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

uct of German chemists. During one of the recent Zeppelin raids on the east coast, police-women working in the town were instructed by the authorities to patrol the streets and do their best to prevent panic or crowds collecting. On coming upon a knot of excited people at a street corner the policewomen assured them that there was no further danger, as the Zeppelins had left and that every one could return home in safety. Some soldiers remonstrated, and said it was cruel to ask the women to take their children home. They pointed to a light in the sky, which they declared to be a bomb dropping. The women wept and begged not to be sent home. The policewomen calmed them, explaining that what the soldiers saw was no bomb, but the planet Venus rising in the sky, and persuaded the crowd to disperse quietly and the parents to take their tired children home.

All this soothing, daring work results from stiff training. These women go through two months of instruction in drill, first aid, special legal acts relating to women and children, and the procedure and rules of evidence in police courts. They are shown how to stand, to walk,

WOMEN

and attain dignity of carriage, for a slouchy woman carries no authority. They are taught to talk clearly and avoid mumbling, so that their evidence will convince the court. They are told off to bring in reports on a tour of the streets: "Come back and tell what you have seen." This develops accuracy and power of observation. Patrolling in the public parks calls for patience to endure the monotony of long, watchful waiting, keen insight to detect undesirable citizens who will endanger children at play, psychological skill in knowing the mental criminal, who works by stealth and loathes publicity.

Street work demands knowledge of the social features of the district, what to do with diseased and sick persons, where to send drunks. The authority must be broad-minded, using a warning word instead of arrest where the offense is petty.

Oversight in factories requires an officer type of woman who will keep the women smart and good tempered, who will deal justly with grumblies, and never bear a personal grievance.

The policewoman is different from the rescue-worker, the "missionary," and the social worker. She is a practical executive who can not long

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

delay with the one case, for there lies on her beat a mile of streets with a dozen other cases. She must show self-control and the willingness to hand over the problem to other agencies. Where her function ceases, there the mission of the social worker begins. In the ranks are nurses, medical women, school-teachers, women from government service, sanitary inspectors. Several matrons of infirmaries and hospitals are making good head officers because they are accustomed to leadership. The ages of policewomen run from twenty-five to forty-five. Between thirty and forty is the best age, because the woman is self-reliant, has conquered her hysterias, and is in full command of her powers. These women have succeeded because they have known how to avoid interference with the province of the men police. They have practised a division of work. There was a city where a particular wooded lane had been a hanging-out place for fourteen years. Constables and the bishop had been powerless to alter conditions. Four policewomen walked the length of it, spoke to thirty-six couples, waited with backs turned till they had accepted the suggestion, and cleaned the place up.

WOMEN

"Which of you is the mother of the baby in the pink cap who has been left outside in the rain for twenty minutes?" asked a policewoman of a group drinking in a public house. The mother had to come, because the opinion of the other guests was with the officer.

Two girls were reported by the police authorities to the policewomen as missing, one of them for fifteen weeks and the other for over five, and were suspected of living in some fields near a large camp. The policewomen on bicycles searched for them for two days, and finally discovered them in a filthy and starving condition and took them back to their parents. They have since applied to the policewomen to put them in touch with a home which deals with such cases.

England is a mixed democracy much like ours, with fine elements and ignoble elements. But these clear-eyed women of the police force, like the nurses and welfare secretaries, gave me an assurance that an immense, untapped resource is there to renew life after the wreckage of these years.

War has discovered them. Peace must con-

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

tinue to make use of them. England has need of them.

Undoubtedly to the student of peoples there was much that was dreary under the beauty and peace of the old England that existed before 1914; but what was most oppressive was the condition of women. Drunkenness and militancy were only two symptoms of a disease that was eating out the heart of an ancient civilization. Women were suppressed. They carried the consciousness of being caught in a social system that allowed no free play for instinct, intelligence, and energy, a system that forbade useful work, that silenced self-expression, that doomed the average middle-class woman to idleness under the mask of respectability, and the lower-class woman to drudgery. There comes a time with a theory when action is the only test, and British women have proceeded to put into practice their claims. I use the policewomen as an illustration of the new activity which has touched all classes. What I wish to show is not their isolated performance. What they have done is only one instance of the release of energy which has won spiritual freedom for the women of England.

CHAPTER IV

IRELAND

THE IRISH QUESTION

I BELIEVE that the most helpful view I can give of the Irish question is a simple record of my brief visit, with the talks I had with Irishmen. I have no solutions, but I have a real sympathy, and I believe that the way to better relationship lies in the creation of an atmosphere of sympathy, which will result in intellectual understanding. I write nothing here in a spirit of contention. I trust that no offense will be taken.

The Irish Rebellion had seemed to me a piece of strange, mystical futility. The failure of Ireland to be stirred by the plight of Roman Catholic Belgium had seemed to me a failure in idealism. The irreconcilable Irish in America had seemed to me a set of men "scrapping" volubly for the sake of words and dissension.

I found in Ireland a national aspiration that

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

moved me as the French spirit of nationality has moved the world for now these two years. The proud and charming Irish people, with a culture, tradition, literature, race, religion, natural geographical unity, and economic system of their own, believe they have the right to as full a measure of self-government as Canada possesses, including control of finances. Sane opinion in Ireland is well aware that in any solution Ireland remains inside the federation of the British commonwealth; but the status toward which the intelligent Irish work is that of a self-governing nation, like the free colonies.

Increasingly the present generation of Irishmen realizes that if old-age pensions, state insurance, land purchase, coöperative grants, the police, estates commission, and congested-districts board have to be paid for by controlled government and crippled autonomy, the answer is a refusal to accept their benefits. Ireland must pay her own way if subsidy implies control. "Irish expenditure should be limited by Irish revenue." This is one of the matters in which some of the older Irish political leaders have failed to represent the younger element.

IRELAND

A living element of young Ireland to-day is in revolt against these older leaders. The men who have patiently and self-sacrificingly fought for the rights of Ireland through long years are still in control of the Irish party at Westminster. A part of young Ireland is as weary of them as a city state once grew of Aristides. To debate the justice of this state of mind is to multiply words, but not to clarify the situation.

The young men believe that the ideas in control of Irish policy are the ideas of old men out of touch with present aspiration. These young men have determined that their own ideas shall prevail.

Tradition is the one essential element in nationality. Tradition is the memory of a common experience, the deposit of a common suffering for an idea. Of tradition Professor Ramsay Muir has written:

The most potent of all nation-molding factors, the one indispensable factor which must be present whatever else be lacking, is the possession of a common tradition, a memory of sufferings endured and victories won in common, expressed in song and legend, in the dear names of great personalities that seem to embody

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

in themselves the character and ideals of the nation, in the names also of sacred places wherein the national memory is enshrined.

A race of writers sprang up in Ireland who had fed on the ancient Gaelic sources. The Irish people rediscovered that they came of a race who had elected their chieftains and who had possessed the land communally. The legends of poets and saints and heroes were recalled to a racial imagination which is responsive, and that fine infection began to spread through the farms and cities. Ireland is not alone in this. She is only a sharer in a general mass consciousness. A movement of nature has operated throughout the modern world. No man can trace its source and origin. It marches irresistibly without visible leadership. It has taken control of a dynastic war, and made it a world war of peoples. It draws the scattered dry bones of Poland back into a living organism. It lifted the France of the Dreyfus Trial into the glory of the Marne and Verdun. It coalesced the quarrelsome individualism of England into the unified, victorious socialistic state. The expression of this world movement is local and intense in Ireland. Clear thinking

IRELAND

is necessary, large concessions, a forgiving state of mind, sound economic and sociological measures, a series of prosaic next steps. A sane trade-union policy, coöperation, education, religious tolerance, clean local politics are demanded to free Ireland from poverty and dissension. Some of this ground-work is already being done. Much is still required. In the Anglo-Irish question there are many points of resemblance to that of capital and labor. Just as the lot of labor has grown steadily better through recent generations, so the condition of Ireland is improving year by year. There have been extensions of justice. Ameliorative agencies are at work. Only four years ago Erskine Childers, the protagonist of Home Rule, wrote:

A great change has taken place in the condition of Ireland during the last nineteen years. We all know its main characteristics, and I need only summarize the result. By contrast with her situation in 1893, Ireland may be said to be completely tranquil and comparatively prosperous. More than half the tenants of Irish land are on the road to freehold ownership; the rest have their rights guarded and their rents limited by law. The great cardinal land reforms, late, terribly late, though they came, laid the foundations of a

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

new social order, and rendered possible a change for the better in every phase of national life. Though all work not done by Ireland herself for her own good must necessarily be defective, we may frankly admit that both English parties in recent years have endeavored to do their best in limited directions to repair the frightful ravages wrought by past misgovernment. The extension of local government to Ireland, focusing the minds of Irishmen upon many of their own local problems, has powerfully contributed to the improvement. Decent, healthy dwellings are replacing the old mud cabins of the laboring classes. There is a National University; there is a central department, with popular influence behind it, for safeguarding and stimulating agriculture and industry. Nearly three millions of money are distributed in Old Age Pensions. Economic serfdom has disappeared. A load of exorbitant rent, and a still heavier load of haunting insecurity, have been removed. The spirit is freer, the physical welfare greater. Production is slowly increasing, and commerce is slowly expanding.

The national university in the great Irish cities has been a belated, but now partly efficient, piece of justice. These colleges carry on scientific research to further industrial development. There is training adapted to the needs of the locality. Trinity produces young doctors,

IRELAND

lawyers, and literary men known throughout the English-speaking world. The Irish land commission, the estates commission, the congested-districts board, labor in their own way to restore the land to the peasant proprietors and to give them decent lodging. The department of agriculture and technical instruction for Ireland informs the peasants in modern methods of agriculture and the development of horticulture. The Irish Agricultural Organization Society is the long official name for the coöperative society of which Sir Horace Plunkett is president, which has 1023 societies, 350 creameries, 95 auxiliary creameries, 233 credit societies, 222 agricultural societies, and a membership of 106,301 persons. It has a turnover of \$90,000,000. The local government board has given Ireland an increasing opportunity in self-government. Industrially Ireland builds ships, makes linen, whisky, stout, ginger-ale, agricultural implements, biscuits. Agriculturally she raises food-stuffs and exports cattle, sheep, horses, butter, eggs. Agriculture and its direct connections employ eighty per cent. of her population, industry twenty per cent.

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

The institutions of education and executive management, the governmental and voluntary departments, the returning prosperity of her forming community, the growing wealth of industrial Ulster—all these are making Ireland a better place to live in than it was in the nineteenth century. Ireland is not going down. She is coming up, and all that improvement is without reference to the Home Rule question.

In the literary world Ireland is very much on the map. I saw three groups of Irish players, at the Abbey Theater, the Empire, and the Irish Theater in Hardwicke Street. These groups gave six plays, containing accurate observation of life and a dramatic idea, rendered with a charm of interpretation. There is to-day no dramatic growth so native and racy in America or England. The Irish writers and poets are among the best in our language. Lady Gregory, Yeats, James Stephens, A. E., Katharine Tynan, Dora Sigerson, Dunsany, George Moore, and Bernard Shaw are worthy representatives of a creative tradition. These poets and prose writers are not like those of England and New England, men speaking a literary dialect unrelated to the

IRELAND

aspiration of the mass of the people. The Irish-men of talent are giving a voice to their race. Irish art is a national expression.

The Irish are a religious race, wherein they differ from the Americans, French, and English of this generation. Unionists and Nationalists are believers. This fundamental conception of life colors their education, literature, and political ideas. For this reason, as well as for many other reasons, it is impossible for an outsider to legislate for them. No policy that omits the sacramental view of life can survive in this land of simple and profound faith.

Such are a few aspects of a community as varied and delightful as I have ever visited. Now I return to my analogy of capital and labor. With each increase of well-being, the laboring classes have only struggled the harder for further gains. They aim at a share in control, not at well-fed contentment in a benevolent industrial autocracy. It is so with the Irish. They have made astonishing gains since 1893.

“Now, we know very well what the Unionists are saying about this improvement,” writes an Irish scholar. “They are saying that it has not

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

only removed the necessity for Home Rule, but weakened the desire for Home Rule."

But the very improvement—improvement in education, in agriculture, in self-government—has only heightened the self-consciousness and intensified the nationality of Ireland. It would be nonsense to say to-day that Ireland is "completely tranquil." Granting that the basic problems are those of self-development, a wise economic policy, a general, compulsory education (now a father can pay a fine of a few shillings a year and keep his child at work instead of at school), a coöperation in every department of community life, instead of the present dissension, which cuts efficiency into small wrangling bits, yet the fact remains that the central cause of unrest, the creator of difference, is the feeling of political servitude.

The study of the Gaelic language is by some regarded as the hope of Ireland and by others as the mother of rebellion. A good-natured reference to Protestants was interpreted by the man sitting behind me in the Empire Theater as an attack on Presbyterianism, and he shouted out his resentment. The trail of political division is

IRELAND

over every cell of the national consciousness. Not one of Ireland's pressing problems can be solved in the present atmosphere.

In the formative years of my life I was educated by an Englishman, an Oxford man. For nine years an Englishwoman has been a member of my household. Most of my spare time in the last sixteen years has been spent in England—eight visits, and a residence of two years at one time. I don't pretend to generalize, but I do claim the right to record personal impressions that are based on a fairly wide observation and experience. I find the largest measure of personal liberty in England of any country which I have visited. I believe the masses in England to be the kindest people known to me. And this well-nigh general kindness and this belief in the rights of the individual man have made England a champion of freedom and justice, for freedom and justice are the social expression of individual good-will and of reverence for personality.

Edward Carpenter says of his people:

The leaden skies of England, and something (if I may say so) rather gray and leaden about the people,

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

have since my early days had the effect of making me feel not quite at home in my own country. I longed for more sunshine, and for something corresponding to sunshine in human nature—more gaiety, vivacity of heart and openness of ideas.

In dealing with an unsuppressed, graceful, and charming race like the Irish, the Englishman is at a hopeless disadvantage. The mental alertness, the flow of language, the swift responsiveness of mood, leave him shy and inarticulate, and, outpointed at every thrust, he takes refuge in his heaviness. The result is offense given and received. It is the tragedy of the English that, kindly and honorable as they are, they have established no real relationship with the most exquisitely imaginative people in the world.

Just now England is in the most bitter warfare of her thousand years. It is humanly impossible for her to turn aside from the work in front of her to solve the wrong inside her commonwealth. To shout her down is to strengthen her enemy at the moment of combat, and her enemy is the enemy of the human race. To weaken her is to weaken the last defense against that force which would destroy nationality

IRELAND

throughout Europe. So the cause of Ireland, like that of exploited labor and suppressed women, must wait the greater decision to the east. But when peace comes, the turn of Ireland comes, and she will be heard at the "round table" of the imperial conference. The modified Lloyd-George "settlement" will again be suggested. That provides for the Home Rule Act for twenty-six counties of Ireland, but excludes from its operation six counties of Ulster which cannot be brought under its terms except by a new act of the imperial Parliament. This proposed settlement goes far in removing Ireland from the former parochial dealings with England, and places Ireland as a self-governing unit within the new British commonwealth. It gives her a better status than in the past, but it leaves unsolved the question of partition, and it withholds financial control. The situation will never be solved at one stroke, however bold, but, rather, by a series of next steps. The same cause for which the English die in Picardy in the noblest war of their history awaits their chivalrous response across the Irish Sea. A little nation desires to be free. In the final judgment of men

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

England's greatness in this day will be measured by the treatment she metes to Ireland.

YOUNG ENGLAND SPEAKS

At my request, one of the younger English statesmen has written this reply to the foregoing chapter:

If the Irish question has to be solved at all, it has to be solved by young England and young Ireland together. The very fact, admitted by all sane opinion in Ireland—that Ireland must remain inside the federation of the British commonwealth—means that the solution is a common and mutual one which cannot in the nature of things be decided by the unaided efforts of Ireland herself. For one thing, take the question of finance. Perhaps the most urgent problems in Ireland are the social reforms which can be carried through only by the expenditure of money. Not only would an absolutely independent Ireland be unable to devote money to new reforms, but she would even have to reduce many of the social expenditures now existing under the heads of old-age pensions, state insurance, congested-

IRELAND

districts board, etc. Young Ireland says that she will reduce her expenditure and limit it by her own revenue rather than accept a subsidy from England implying English control. Young England, on the other hand, is obliged to reply, in words familiar to American political thought, that a subsidy from England to Ireland without some control would be taxation of the English people without representation, and is therefore constitutionally unthinkable as anything like a permanent arrangement. But the actual constitutional counterpart of payments between states united in the same federated commonwealth is a matter of adjustment which need not imply any loss of independence or self-government. The only thing necessary to the creation of such constitutional machinery is mutual consultation.

And somewhere here lies the real tragedy of the Irish Rebellion. Young England—the England that was finding itself in “The Round Table,” in the Workers’ Educational Association, and to a certain extent even in the Unionist Social Reform Committee—had, before the war, become inexpressibly weary of the atmosphere in which

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

the Anglo-Irish question was carried on at Westminster. They knew not only the failure of English government in Ireland, but also the souring and clogging effect of the Irish party at Westminster upon the Government of England. They, in common with many well-known Irishmen in Ireland who had cut themselves off from political factions during the last fifteen years—the Plunketts, the Mounteagles, the Russells—recognized men like Connolly and the whole young Irish party, whose aspirations you have described, as far more competent to deal with the problem in a fundamental way than the Nationalists at Westminster. Such members of young England found their ideas best summed up by that poem in which A. E. confesses “the golden heresy of truth.” They really thought that out of young Ireland was growing a party with whom they could work in the immediate introduction of Home Rule within a federated British Empire which more than anything else satisfied their longing for a comprehensive policy.

Such men, cast down into the depths by the bickerings of July, 1914, rejoiced to see their hopes confirmed by the sweeping change in Eng-

IRELAND

land which followed the outbreak of war—by the obliteration in all but a few journalistic and parliamentary circles of the old pre-war contests.

The hopes of this young England, which is now to a man in the trenches or in government departments absorbed in the overwhelming duties of war, have been cheated much as the hopes of those young American enthusiasts who in 1911, during the Lawrence strike, hailed the syndicalists and Giovanitti as truer representatives of the aspirations of labor than the older trade-unions, have been soured and destroyed by the petty bitterness and futility of “the masses.” But the disappointment was far more deadly. The Irish Rebellion was to them the stab in the back from just the people with whom they felt best able to coöperate after the war, and it was a stab all the more fatal because young England did not lose its respect for leaders like Connolly. They still say they would rather have seen Ireland under the government of a man of this stamp than ten men from the Ulster army or from the orthodox Nationalist party.

The average man in the street in England to-day, so far from wishing to govern Ireland,

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

has only one idea, to clear out of Ireland as quickly as possible. Ireland to him is not a field for the administrative qualities of the English any more than Quebec or the Transvaal. It is a field for their political qualities. It is a part of the self-governing empire, not one of the dependencies; it is a nation of equals, co-authors with the English of the British Empire, co-settlers and comrades-in-arms, not a "backward race." Young England insists that, while a despairing severance of relations between England and Ireland in the spirit of Joan of Arc "as to the peace with the English, the only one possible is that they should go back to their own country in England," though it would be better than the present situation, would be as futile and unnecessary as Lee in 1861 believed the severance of Virginia from Massachusetts. There is no need for Ireland to starve herself of money in the belief that a federal government at Westminster must mean loss of self-government in Ireland. And just because Ireland is not a backward race or merely a wronged race, young England cannot be content with the application to her of the policy of Indian reformers in the United States,

IRELAND

“Give the Indian his portion and clear out.”

The only thing that could prevent the inevitable righteous and peaceful settlement of the Irish question would be a feeling in young England that the Irish revolutionists have gained applause not for all their aspirations and policies with which young England ardently sympathized, but for the last mad mistake which led young Ireland to desert the cause of liberty at the very moment of Verdun. It is this applause coming from America—the bitterness of Roman Catholic pulpits in Boston and Chicago, the railings of mass meetings in New York, the irresponsible perorations of Irish-American politicians—that chiefly threatens the future of Ireland. Young England saw a vision before the war, and that vision has been confirmed by the sufferings of the war. Young England will come back from the trenches few (how few!) in numbers, but with new determination for the future. They cannot and will not accept from America that last and worst doctrine of reaction, the doctrine of Lot’s wife, who, looking back on a past already redeemed, remained a pillar of bitterness for all future generations.

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

THE SIAMESE TWIN

To talk about Ireland and omit Ulster is to construct an Algebra by omitting x . A portion of Ulster is resolutely determined to stay outside Irish self-government. This section is friendly to England, is in favor of British rule in Ireland, is Protestant, and is industrially a powerful community. To go into the history of this division would be barren, so I pick up the situation as it is to-day. A large number of young Irish Nationalists wish the coming Ireland to be a seamless garment, one and indivisible. A famous song in Ireland is that of Thomas Davis, "A Nation Once Again":

And then I prayed I yet might see
Our fetters rent in twain,
And Ireland, long a province, be
A nation once again.

The phrase "a nation once again" is as famous in Ireland as "government of the people" among us. When the plan of excluding certain counties of Ulster fell through, the sentiment of young Nationalist Ireland turned against any compromise which would omit any part of Ireland from

IRELAND

Home Rule, and the song was parodied "Three Quarters of a Nation Once Again."

A farcical skit was recently produced at the Abbey Theater in Dublin, called "Partition." It shows a house lying exactly on the border-line of Ulster and Leinster, so that one half the house is in each province. ("There is a village," says the program, "half of which would be under the proposed Home Rule Jurisdiction and the other half under the control of the Executive for the excluded counties.") Andy Kelly, who lives in the house, shifts his furniture to the Ulster side when the Home Rule bailiffs come to sell him up. When both sets of bailiffs come, he draws a chalk mark, and piles his household stuff in the center of the room. A fine scrap breaks out between the representatives of the two governments. Andy's summary of the situation is this:

"I 'm a Siamese twin. I 'm a sort of a two in wan, an' now look here, it 's the queerest thing —what kind of a hole would ye be in if wan of the twins was to steal somethin' an' maybe th' other lad as innocent as a baby, shure ye could n't cut them in two an' ye could n't put both o' them

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

in jail wid wan o' them maybe provin' an alibi."

The play ends with "General fighting, furniture all over the place, women screaming. The village cornet-player is heard in the distance playing 'A Nation Once Again.'" As the curtain falls, Andy says, "Begobs the Siamese twins will be kilt and buried in the wan coffin."

Professor John MacNeill, who was head of the Irish Volunteers before the Easter Rising, and who is now serving a life sentence in prison as a "rebel," wrote concerning the Ulster cul de sac:

"I urge the Irish people to permit no surrender on the partition question."

And these are his reasons:

Politically speaking, Ulster is made up of a compact Nationalist West in Donegal, a less intact Unionist East in Antrim and Down, with two great Nationalist limbs and two great Unionist limbs alternately lying almost from side to side of the province. If you take two of those horseshoe-shaped breakfast rolls and dovetail one into the other, you will have a rough approximate plan of political Ulster.

The partition of Ulster would give rise to a state of things for which one would have to go to the Balkan peninsula under the Disraelian "settlement" for a parallel.

IRELAND

If you cut the more compact areas of the Plantation off from Ireland *de jure* and *de facto*, you will make a real enemy of their inhabitants, and arm them with greater powers of mischief than they have ever possessed since the days when the old race and the new were at open war. You would have a recognized Lesser Britain, and a lesser Britain *irredenta* stretching right through the heart of Ulster, with kinsmen and sympathizers all over Ireland. What opportunities for a lively time! And the Ireland *irredenta* made fast in the midst of the British territory would not be behindhand.

If Catholic and Protestant roughly correspond in Ireland to Nationalist and anti-Nationalist, there must be some other cause than religious sentiment operating through religious sentiment to create national disunion.

The Ulster Unionist has been taught to regard himself as a full-blooded Teuton and his Catholic neighbor as a full-blooded Celt. It is not a fact of race, but an illusion of race, that makes Ulster Unionists pro-British and anti-Irish.

There are not two Irish nations. A foreign “faction” is a familiar feature in many a national history. We have in the Irish nation of to-day a foreign faction. I have found myself in Belfast right in the zone of fire between two stone throwing mobs, one Catholic, the other Protestant. Nobody will persuade me that either Irish nationality or British supremacy was the spirit that projected those showers of missiles. It was

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

simple primitive savagery with religion for an excuse and politics for a super-excuse.

Suppose we Nationalists declare every man who uses anti-Protestant party cries, or in any way interferes with Protestant demonstrations, to be the worst enemy of his country's cause. I would begin the task of persuasion with the economic unity of Ireland as the main argument. Once Ireland ceases to be a goose to be plucked, it will be impossible to persuade the English people to charge themselves any longer with responsibility for her internal affairs. With the excess of Irish taxation once down, the burden of Irish internal administration would have been unshouldered by the British Parliament. Home Rule without financial reform is a mere fantasy. So long as Ireland consents to pay Great Britain three millions a year clear profit for being misgoverned, so long will the Unionist Party succeed in persuading the British elector to make no rash changes. It is safe to say that one-tenth or £30,000 is drawn out of the city of Belfast alone, and one-fifth, £60,000, is filched from the Unionists of Ulster. The question for Nationalists is the money question. The country will soon want to know what its political leaders are going to do about this appalling robbery. No self-government worth having will ever be gained except by the previous victory of a practically united Ireland over British spoliation.

I give his analysis in detail, because it is the

IRELAND

clear expression of a wide-spread, subconscious desire of Irish Nationalists for a united Ireland. James Stephens, the charming Irish writer whose "Crock of Gold" and "Here Are Ladies" are known to American readers, says in interpreting the desire of Ireland to assume control of her national life:

This ideal of freedom has captured the imagination of the race. It rides Ireland like a nightmare, thwarting or preventing all civilizing or cultural work in this country.

And the way to obtain freedom he gives:

The safeguards which Ulster will demand, should events absolutely force her to it, may sound political or religious, they will be found essentially economic, and the root of them all will be a water-tight friendship with England. We must swallow England if Ulster is to swallow us.

Opposed, then, to the idea of an Ulster bitterly hostile to any form of union with the rest of Ireland, we have the plan of a colonial self-government for Ireland inside the British commonwealth, with a guaranteed friendliness of relationship with England and with Ulster.

How to obtain this in practice? An answer

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

was given to me by A. E. A. E. is the greatest living “pure” Irishman. By his “purity” I mean that he has lived his life in Ireland instead of crossing the channel for his career like Shaw. Many Irishmen of talent have transplanted themselves where fame and power and the delightful contacts of a prosperous civilization can be had on easy terms. But Paris and New York and London have piped in vain to George Russell. Poet, dramatist, journalist, editor, painter, essayist, prophet of coöperation, organizer—he has carried on his various and vital activities in his homeland. “A. E. is the one great thing left to us besides the Nelson Pillar,” said James Stephens to me. Russell writes one of the richest and most perfect prose styles of the present day, and he has devoted that technic to the production of “The Homestead,” the official organ of the Irish coöperative movement. Very literally he stands on Irish soil, and speaks to the peasant population. He is fifty-one years old, with the laughter and generous heart of a boy, and he will die with all his fine hopes in him. There is something chivalrous about him, something young and fierce and burning. His face

IRELAND

is the face of the portrait of William Morris: the abundant beard, the living eyes, the look of the mystic who puts his dreams into action. He is the same sort of many-handed, many-minded man. This is the way out of the English-Ulster-Nationalist muddle as he sees it and as he gave it to me. To get the full drive of it, one must see the bulky, shaggy man, simpler and more human than most men, with fun and vitality in his talk. He said:

The Irish question is not only national, but involves questions of international economics. Irish linen is sent over the world. Belfast ships are sold to British and American buyers. Belfast ginger-ale is sold in California. Industrial Ulster fears the laws that would be passed in a legislature where seventy-five per cent. of the members would be representatives of small farmers, men whose views are parochial and who have no knowledge of the intricate problems manufacturers engaged in international trade have to solve. Irish Nationalists ought to meet those views, and prove to Ulster that her trade interests would not be prejudiced in an Irish parliament, and give real and not verbal guarantees on this point. Protestant Ulster fears religious discrimination in a parliament which might be three-quarters Roman Catholic. The most powerful political organization in Ireland, the Ancient

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

Order of Hibernians, is a sectarian and semi-secret society of which no Protestant can be a member. Ulster has some reason to be troubled. When we consider Home Rule for Ireland, there are five things which must be considered:

1. The point of view of Great Britain. Great Britain will always rightly demand that Ireland be friendly to the imperial alliance. It is clearly impossible that England should allow an unfriendly power to have freedom for independent action in Ireland.

2. The point of view of the Irish Nationalists. They desire the political unity of Ireland, and will not have partition. They desire full Irish control over the trade policy and over taxation. Until they win that full control, they will have continuous agitation and there will be unfriendly feelings between the two countries.

The point of view of Ulster in the following matters:

Ulster requires assurances that the self-governing Ireland she enters into will be friendly to Great Britain. Ulster carries on an immense trade with England. She builds ships for England. She exports linen and other goods. She has orders from great shipping firms and from the admiralty. These orders would not go to a self-governing Ireland with nagging, unfriendly politicians in control, and Ulster's trade would decline. She could be crippled economically by race hatreds expressed in an Irish parliament.

IRELAND

Ulster demands guaranties both economic and religious as to her own position in a self-governing Ireland. The Nationalists should meet Ulster on all these points. It should be demonstrated to her that under Home Rule Ireland will be friendly to Great Britain, and just to the religious and industrial life of Ulster. Nationalists, in my opinion, should offer Ulster political power equal to her economic power. This might be arranged partly by proportional representation by dividing Ireland into twelve great constituencies, so that the Protestants could return members from districts where they are now without a representative. I suggest also that the senate, or upper house, should have a veto power for a certain number of years until the traditions of government were fixed, say ten or twelve years, and that a majority of members in the senate for that time should be nominated by Ulster. We have a model in the Canadian Senate, which is always packed with a majority adverse to the party in power. This is accomplished by permitting the party in power to nominate vacancies in the senate. The party coming in finds a majority of the opposing party in the Senate, and the old party so retains a measure of control. The Irish senate might be formed on the assumption that Irish Unionists had gone out of power and had left the senate packed with a two-thirds majority of their party. Such a device could not be continued indefinitely because it is not demo-

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

cratic. But use that method for ten or twelve or even fifteen years until the political tradition of self-government had become fixed and Ulster is reassured. For the Irish question, we need a psychological solution, because in the years of dissension the people have tied their souls into knots. I am sure the Ulster men would not use the power of veto against national interests for the period they were given it.

Sir Edward Carson has said that what Ulster feared was not bad law-making. "What we do fear is oppressive administration." They fear that public offices will be packed with friends of the party in power, that the policy of "to the victors belong the spoils" will be practised. It is necessary to reassure Ulster that all public posts would be removed from jobbery, and that merit should have its open chance of winning promotion. The way to do this is to make all government positions, all posts paid for out of public moneys, whether under boards of guardians or county councils, part of a national civil service, so that jobbery on account of religion or politics would be impossible. Along these lines of concession and balance of power I do not regard the special Ulster problem as insoluble.

England should make the Irish question a national question with herself, not a party question. Whenever war is on, a coalition government is formed. So it should be in dealing with Ireland. Ireland should

IRELAND

be treated by a coalition of forces in England, considering its Irish polity as a national question. If Ireland were so dealt with, the opposition of Ulster to settlement would lessen.

The present method of splitting Ireland and misgoverning it has led to a reduction of its population by one-half in seventy years. That is bad for Ireland and it is bad for England, because Ireland's exiles in other countries develop bad feeling against England.

There are only two ways to deal with Ireland, either complete union, with absolute equality, or else complete Irish control of purely Irish affairs. The Home Rule bill as passed would not settle the question, because it does not grant to Ireland the fixing of taxation and the trade policy. Whoever has financial and economic control of a people fixes the character of the civilization of that people. There is no British reason for passing a Home Rule bill unless to settle the question. Either England must control Ireland by making Irish people into English people in sentiment and culture, or else she must grant to Ireland the status of a dominion. England must retain control of military, naval, and foreign policy. Let Ireland send representatives not to the British Parliament, but to the new imperial parliament, which is certain to be formed after the war. Let her pay her contribution to imperial defense prepared by assessors appointed for that purpose by Great Britain and the dominions.

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

What we should aim at is a kind of Sinn Fein imperialism, a complete control of internal affairs and a participation in the empire's polity.

The feeling for complete independence had gradually been dying down to a romantic feeling such as Scotchmen feel for Prince Charlie. Then came the Ulster and Nationalist Volunteers, the recruiting campaign, the rebellion, the executions, martial law, and the old feeling rose up again. It has become an intolerable nuisance not to have these political questions settled. I think myself too much importance is attached to the location of government, and I have myself more hope in voluntary economic and cultural movements than in acts of Parliament. But with the present political unrest, there is no fixed policy in the economic life of Ireland. Business men wish a fixed policy. They wish to have more certitude in business matters. If Ireland was contented, it could turn to the problems of internal government. We have over two thousand national teachers paid less than thirty pounds a year. The money has been put on the constabulary, which is over-manned. A government has its choice of leaving people ignorant and spending money on a police force to keep them in order or of educating them and cutting down the constabulary. England plumped for the police. No country can govern another country properly, and never has any country done so. Countries can unite with another in

IRELAND

a federation, but no country can rule another. You see the attempt made by Germans and Russians in Poland. But it can only succeed by exterminating the people governed. The plantations in Ireland were an attempt at that.

In the last one hundred years Ireland lost the power to speak Gaelic. Only 600,000 of her people speak the language to-day. And yet Gaelic literature contains the dreams and soul of the Irish people for two thousand years. It is one of the oldest and most beautiful literatures in Europe. That lost race memory is a loss in the dignity and spirituality of their life. Imagine the Greeks without Homer. So it has been of late with the Irish in the loss of their national literature—legends and poetry. The Irish do not read English literature nor have they accepted English culture. That ancient literature of theirs ran like an underground river for the last century till it came welling up again in Standish O'Grady, Stephens, Yeats, and Synge. There is a reshaping of legendary tales, and Anglo-Irish literature will be powerfully affected. Gaelic schools have sprung up. O'Grady and Synge knew Gaelic. Padraic Colum knows it. Stephens can read it. MacDonagh and Pearse knew it. The Celtic spirit of Ireland is emerging in the poems and tales of modern Anglo-Celtic literature which are as acceptable to Ulster as to the rest of Ireland.

A. E.'s solution, then, is to clear the political

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

question by concession and guaranty, to forget it, and to get down to business—the business being coöperation. Is this the dream of Ireland's most glorious dreamer, or is there salvation that way?

I left Mr. Russell, and stepped down-stairs in Plunkett House to the executive offices of the coöperative movement.

“While the gun-running was on,” said one of the coöperative organizers to me, “our movement was including both parties in the fight. Carson’s men were arming themselves, and the Volunteers were arming against them. But both sets were working together in our society. Each had their guns buried with which to shoot the other, but they were busy in one creamery, working in harmony, and pooling their economic life. They differ politically, but their interests are one.”

POVERTY: THE REAL IRISH QUESTION

The real Irish question is poverty. Agricultural labor receives less than three dollars a week. The tenant and owner and laborer, when averaged up, receive only \$3.50 a week. Even the brief and dubious money gains of war-time are

IRELAND

not an offset for depreciated “plant,” and the stock of cattle and equipment of agricultural utensils are steadily depreciating in these days of an increased export trade. The slums of Irish cities are among the worst in Europe. Dublin is known as the “one-room city,” because over sixty thousand of her people are congested. Industrial labor is underpaid. Preferential through rates on the railroads have given Irish markets to English producers. Many of the farms are too small for economic working, and what there is of them is not good enough soil. Much of the best tillage remains in the hands of the landlords, and is used for grazing instead of for the production of crops. The hope of Ireland lies in trade-unionism, education, and coöperation. Ireland’s real problem is to increase production and distribute prosperity.

I found Ireland stimulated by the report that Henry Ford was planning a factory in Cork. He was said to have taken an option on a race-course, to plan the diversion of the river, and to guarantee a minimum wage of twenty-one shillings to his workers. The story ran that he had visited his mother’s birthplace in Cork, and out

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

of the personal tie grew his plan to revive the industrial life of Ireland. If the very rumor has given cheer to an underpaid population, how much new hope will flow in if Irish-Americans, whose hearts bleed for Ireland, will invest some of their money in Irish agriculture and industry! A few million dollars invested where their heart is will relieve a pressure on Ireland, which to-day is resulting in bad housing, under-nourishment, overwork, and an undue proportion of pauperism. The real Irish question is not solved by political wrangling and chronically jangled nerves inside the island, or by hot temper at long distance. The Irish-Americans who have planted the tradition of Ireland's wrongs in the United States are two generations out of date. If they would get into touch with young Ireland, they would find they were chewing over stale grievances which the march of thought has long passed by. They are as much out of date as Marxian socialists. The present campaign is based on concrete issues, requiring a record of facts, and organization. American money is not needed for nationalistic propaganda. It is needed for agricultural and industrial development. Our

IRELAND

rich Irish-Americans can do an immense service to Ireland. They can aid to set her free, but not by parliamentary debates, speech-making campaigns, and pitiful, abortive rebellions. They can set her free by standing security for land improvement, better housing, the purchase of machinery and fertilizer plants.

Had the Irish question been settled (by the Irish question I must insist that I mean not the comic-opera politics of gun-running, but the agricultural and industrial redemption of Ireland), this war would have been an easier task for England. The submarine blockade would have been a minor factor. Ireland's natural market is England. England is on an industrial basis, and needs the food-stuff of an agricultural country like Ireland. Every mistake England has made in the long past in Ireland has cost her severely in money and lives in this war. A unified, economically prosperous Ireland could have fed England, and left her free to raise her army and make munitions, and the submarine would have been powerless to touch one shipload of produce plying across the Irish Channel. As it is, England has had to buy her supplies from

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

several nations, and the long sea-haul has been over open waters where the submarine has sunk an ever-growing number of food-ships. By postponing the settlement of Ireland's status as an autonomous nation inside the British commonwealth, England has lessened her own food-supply and lengthened the war. As long as Ireland is politically in a fever, she refuses to settle down to her real job of mastering the conditions of her own life, which will be determined by better land and more land, better methods of cropping, fertilizers, machinery, labor supply, organization for producing and selling, and railroad facilities. There would be little value in writing one more contentious article on Ireland. So with the charges of a national incompetency and inefficiency, which those who deny self-government to Ireland allege as the ground for their denial. They find this incapacity due to three defects in Irish character: laziness, a tendency to dissension, and a tendency to grafting. They say that the Irishman is not a confirmed worker, that he loves to wrangle, and that he favors his friends at the expense of his community when he is in political office. The Irish

IRELAND

reply, "the penal laws, the ascendancy system, the union with its anti-Irish 'National' schools, its 'West Briton' ideals, martial law, these are the causes of that national incompetency of ours." One remembers in this connection the famous passage of Graham Wallas in "*The Great Society*" on the rights of little nations:

Athens during the last quarter of the fifth century B. C. was not well governed; and if the British Empire had then existed, and if Athens had been brought within it, the administration of the city would undoubtedly have been improved in some important respects. But one does not like to imagine the effect on the intellectual output of the fifth century B. C. if even the best of Mr. Rudyard Kipling's public-school subalterns had stalked daily through the agora, snubbing, as he passed, that intolerable bounder Euripides, or clearing out of his way the probably seditious group that were gathered round Socrates.

The time for argument on what Matthew Arnold called "barren logomachies" is past. Ireland will soon receive her independence in the British commonwealth. The time for action has come, and that action must proceed out of Irishmen in productive agriculture, efficient industry, and clean and tolerant government.

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

Among the happy communities of the past were the Greek city states, the twelfth-century communes, and the pioneering settlements of America. They were happy because the citizens had a measure of equality and because the terms of life included spiritual values. Life was not organization, knowledge, work, pleasure, efficiency, but through these means developed an excellence of its own finer than the machinery through which it functioned and the material on which it worked. By the natural conditions of the country and the temperament of the people Ireland is fitted to be one of the happy communities of human history instead of a land of sorrows. Peasant proprietorship in a fertile country among a people of social and imaginative nature ought to take the curse from life, because life under such conditions offers equality, intercourse, prosperity, and a free play for spiritual values.

No old time battle-cry or politico-economic dogma can survive in the light of to-day's facts. Landlordism was the old cry, and it expressed a hideous injustice. But "if all rent were abolished in Ireland to-morrow the chief difficulties of the Irish farmer would remain what they are.

IRELAND

It would not raise the price of anything the farmer has to sell, or increase the produce of an acre of his land.” “The long war over the land, which resulted in the transference of the land from landlord to cultivator, has advanced us part of the way, but the land acts offered no complete solution. We were assured by hot enthusiasts of the magic of proprietorship, but Ireland has not tilled a single acre more since the land acts were passed. The welfare of Ireland depends mainly upon the welfare of the Irish farmer.”

So it is worth considering his case in detail. A clear statement of it is given by A. E., who is one of the three men at the head of the coöperative movement. He says:

The small farmer is the typical Irish countryman. The average area of an Irish farm is twenty-five acres or thereabouts. We can imagine to ourselves an Irish farmer with twenty-five acres to till, lord of a herd of four or five cows, a drift of sheep, a litter of pigs, perhaps a mare and foal: call him Patrick Malony and accept him as symbol of his class. . . . He is fruitful enough. There is no race suicide in Ireland. His agriculture is largely traditional. His butter, his eggs, his cattle, horses, pigs, and sheep are sold to local dealers. He might be described almost as the

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

primitive economic caveman, the darkness of his cave unillumined by any ray of general principles. . . . The culture of the Gaelic poets and story-tellers, while not often actually remembered, still lingers like a fragrance about his mind. We ponder over Patrick, his race, and his country, brooding whether there is the seed of a Pericles in Patrick's loins. Could we carve an Attica out of Ireland?

Before Patrick can become the father of a Pericles, before Ireland can become an Attica, Patrick must be led out of his economic cave. . . . Our poets sang of a united Ireland, but the unity they sang of was only a metaphor. It mainly meant separation from another country. Individualism, fanatically centering itself on its family and family interests, interfered on public boards to do jobs in the interests of its kith and kin. The coöperative movement connects with living links the home, the center of Patrick's being, to the nation, the circumference of his being. . . . I believe the fading hold the heavens have over the world is due to the neglect of the economic basis of spiritual life. The coöperative movement alone of all movements in Ireland has aspired to make an economic solidarity in Ireland.

The social and economic service of coöperation is this: it enables farmers to own and use modern machinery, to buy feeding material, manures, and seeds, and to construct fertilizer

IRELAND

plants at low cost, standard quality, and on large scale. It gives control over markets, and slowly improves the transportation facilities for produce. It sells to advantage through its own agents instead of through a long circuit of middlemen. It gives a system for borrowing money at a lower interest and for a longer term. It pools the ideas of many men and gives an interchange and interaction of ideas, leading to close, hard economic thinking, invention and discovery, and a wide-spread intellectual fertilization. In one place where a creamery was nearly started, the coöperators report, the whole scheme was destroyed by the announcement of a leader of public opinion that "every pound of butter must be made on Nationalist principles or not at all." But the work of uncoiling ancient grievance from constructive enterprise goes on, and prosperity cures ill will. You will see in a single village the coöperative societies supplying seeds, manures, and machinery to the farmers, establishing credits, marketing eggs gathered by the women, running a station to improve the breed of poultry, conducting a knitting industry, and selling groceries and provisions.

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

There comes a limit of saturation, and coöperation has probably sucked up as many peasants as its present capacity admits. That capacity must be increased if coöperation is to increase in the next twenty years at the rate of the last twenty. More and better land, now held by landlords for grazing, must be freed for tillage. The existent railways must provide better facilities for farmers. A system of spur railways to mine-pit heads and of light railways through neglected districts must be established. The village of Belmullet in western Mayo is forty-six miles from a railroad. There are anthracite seams a few miles out from Dublin. Seven miles of light railway, at a cost of \$1,250,000, would connect the mine with its market, and reduce the cost of that coal from forty-three or forty-five shillings to twenty-five shillings. One of the young Irish leaders says, "Any extensive working of Irish coal or copper is contingent on the assent of the vast British mining interest to Irish competition." The creation of machinery and fertilizer must be undertaken on a larger scale. In short, production must be increased by the application of capital. Can that capital be

IRELAND

found? Will it be by Irish parliamentary grant, by Irish taxation, or by foreign investment, or will the coöoperators themselves be willing to lay aside a percentage of their profit for the purpose of extending the movement till it has embraced all Ireland? A solution must be found, for a movement either grows or dies.

The present situation is abnormal. The estimated value of Irish exports to Great Britain for 1916 is over two hundred million dollars' worth. Before the war they averaged about one hundred and forty millions. A clear gain in money of sixty million dollars has flowed in to Irish farmers. Fish, butter, and eggs have at times been held up for lack of shipping, but that is because the shipping has been destroyed on other hauls, which would have been unnecessary if Irish agriculture were developed up to capacity.

Ireland sends live stock and the produce of live stock to Great Britain. She sends sheep and mutton, bacon, ham, live pigs, poultry, butter, and eggs. Next to the production of live stock, the marketing of butter is the most important industry. The farmer has received increased

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

prices to account for most of this gain, but the production also has been somewhat increased. Some of this extra money has gone for increased cost of production, feeding stuffs, and fertilizer. The rest of the money has been banked.

"The last two years are the most phenomenal in Ireland's history," says the department of agriculture, and they tell me that "the farmer has come off in a gold coach" during these war months. Plunkett House, headquarters of the coöperators, tells me that there is undoubtedly more money return, but that the farmer's live-stock has been sold, and must be replaced, and that his plant has deteriorated, so that he is n't any better off in productive wealth. Such a thing as agreement on any matter in Ireland is not obtainable in the present atmosphere of passion. It is probable that the law of gravitation violates the Sinn Fein principle of self-help, and that the ethics of the gospel are under suspicion in four counties of Ulster. "What too many people in Ireland mistake for thoughts are feelings. Passion has become dominant in our politics." But in the end Ireland must be ruled not by rhetoric, but by "first-class thinking on the

IRELAND

life of the countryman. The genius of rural life has not yet appeared."

The Irish situation is the heritage of landlordism, usury, famine, land legislation, grazing, emigration. When these had operated, Ireland was reduced in population, and the good land was let out in vast grazing tracts, and the poorer land was crowded by farmers. These crowded areas are called congested districts. The congested-districts board exists for the purpose of cutting those areas up into holdings, enlarging existing holdings till they become a "paying proposition" instead of uneconomic, making roads, and creating new holdings. This is a long job, and will consume many years before completion. It requires both time and money, and there is a shortage of money, as the British Government has shut down on the extension of financial help.

"Counties like Meath, with the richest land in Ireland, are under grass and virtually destitute of all life save the bullocks which graze in their fields."

The total cultivated area of Ireland is 2,400,000 acres. In pasture and grazed mountain land there remain 12,500,000 acres. Live stock

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

is to crop production as four is to three. There were 500,000 acres in wheat in 1851. In 1914 there were 36,000, a decrease of 92 $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. The total decrease in tillage has been seventy per cent. Eleven per cent. of Ireland is now arable land, and sixty-four per cent. hay and pasture. Eleven per cent. of France is hay and pasture, and fifty-two per cent. arable land.

The land acts are permissive, not compulsory, and the landlord can refuse to sell. He does so refuse, and continues to hold the land for grazing. Compulsory purchase was proposed in a bill, but the landlords' convention rejected the bill, and the British Government was unwilling to press a contentious measure.

While I was in Ireland the Earl of Meath had his estate agent write in reply to a request that he allow his uncultivated land to be parceled out for the production of food:

His lordship is in sympathy with the general idea that more land should, during the war, be brought under cultivation for the production of food. Lord Meath has not a large quantity of land in Bray, and he would be glad to know if others, who may have more, have been approached by your society and, if not, why this

IRELAND

has not been done. He considers that the supply of milk in a populous district like Bray is a more pressing question than that of any other kind of food, and that any diminution in grazing lands would inevitably raise its price. For these reasons Lord Meath cannot see his way to accede to your request.

In his case the request had been made that a portion of land be given to meet the national need. But the same refusal is widely met when compensation is offered. By a liberal use of state credit the farmer has got back some of the land which was taken away from his grandfather. He has paid a fair price for purchase, which is from twenty to forty per cent. below his old rents. One farmer, for instance, now pays fourteen pounds a year toward the purchase of his holding where he used to pay eighteen pounds in rent. But the process is slow and partial. So in Ireland to-day there is still an unappeased land hunger. Still the holdings are often too small and too poor. Still half the land is held by landlords, and agriculture is crippled. The Irish radicals write of the late Home Rule Bill:

There is no provision for ever transferring land purchase in Ireland to the control of the Irish Parliament.

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

It will be at least eighty years before land purchase is completed.

There are five million good acres which ought to be brought back under tillage at once. If any of this land could be held by the farmer on a full year's lease, it would come under the terms of the "agricultural holding" acts, and automatically would be open for tillage. But the landlord lets it out for grazing for eleven months, and then snaps it back for the last month, so as to evade the provisions of the law. This "eleven months' lease" is as noisome in Ireland as the injunction in America. As there is an immediate market for cattle, the small farmers bid against one another for grazing land. They cannot afford to wait for the slower greater market for grain which would be theirs if they boycotted the grazing lands till the owners sold them for tillage. Nothing short of a mandatory state policy will cure this primary cause of Irish poverty.

Every statement of an economic situation requires careful qualification. Ireland has made a steady gain since the ebb-tide of the 1850's. Her deposits and cash balances in joint-stock banks, post-office and trustee savings-banks, were re-

IRELAND

cently \$410,000,000 as against \$145,000,000 in 1871. She held \$235,000,000 in government stocks two years ago. The business of the railways nearly doubled in thirty years, though much of this money went into English hands, and the railway system is imperfect and ununified. In 1871 her emigration was 71,000; in 1914, 20,000. No picture of degeneration fits the facts. But the reconstructive legislation and state grants and credit system have brought Ireland only half-way. A bolder, more drastic program must now be adopted if she is to overcome poverty and become the productive country which is her true destiny. Machinery and fertilizer must be purchased on a far larger scale, the land must be opened up, a better system of cropping used, factories for agricultural plant must be established, housing must be bettered. Faith in her future is what Ireland needs from her friends, and money as the expression of that faith. The labor- and trade-unionists of Ireland have faced this situation, and their conference stated:

We demand that steps be taken immediately to bring under cultivation large areas of the grazing lands—by direct labor on an extensive scale under the Depart-

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

ment; by empowering County Councils to proceed on similar lines; by calling upon all local authorities to utilize every acre of suitable land within their areas now lying idle for spade cultivation, for potatoes and vegetables; by offering advances of capital to local bodies where necessary to finance these schemes; to make unprofitable by punitive taxation the keeping out of cultivation of excessive proportions of agricultural holdings, and that the Government grant facilities for the manufacture and importation of agricultural machinery and fertilizers and their distribution at actual cost.

The Irish party's committee on food supply protests against the delays of the past, and urges that the congested-districts board and estates commissioners should be equipped to proceed with the permanent division of grass-lands. It advocates compulsory tillage. This would mean that the Government demands that the holder till a percentage, say from ten to twenty-five per cent. (later to be increased) of his land. The small farmer would thus be required to till six or seven acres instead of four or five.

His reply will be, "Where can I get the labor? The disease which has attacked our great populations here and in America is a discontent with

IRELAND

rural life." In less than fifty years 300,000 agricultural laborers have left the Irish fields for American factories. Till the war fifty thousand Irishmen every year went to England and Scotland for the harvest. (That fell to 13,000 in the first year of the war.) The department of agriculture reports, "There has been for many years a marked scarcity of agricultural laborers in Ireland." In 1871 there were 446,000 male agricultural laborers and 62,000 female. In 1911 there were fewer than 200,000 male, and there were only 4000 females.

The reason is plain: better wages are obtainable elsewhere. In 1914 the agricultural wage of Ireland had a cash value of eleven shillings and threepence a week. Why did not the farmer pay more? He was not able to. The average cash return to all classes connected with the farm, farmer-owner, farmer-tenant, and laborer, when added together and averaged, was only twelve shillings and ninepence, so the farmer was paying all he could afford.

Only higher production, through better land, machinery, and coöperation, can solve the wage of the farm-hand. The laborers will never be

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

half so numerous as farmers, for Ireland is “a country of small holdings, where the farmer and his family are themselves laborers.” The co-operative ownership of expensive machinery will increasingly lead to the communal employment of the laborer as a skilled mechanic by the co-operative community. If the belief of the co-operators comes true, that in half a century the whole business of rural Ireland (and that is eighty per cent. of Ireland) will be done coöperatively, then we have the solution for the present scarcity of labor. “The agricultural laborers will gradually become skilled mechanics, able to direct threshers, binders, diggers, cultivators, and new implements we have no conception of. They will be members of the society, sharing in its profits in proportion to their wages, even as the farmer will in proportion to his trade. The laborers will form societies for collective farming as in Rumania and Italy.” It is possible that in this direction may lie the solution not only for the laborer, but for the bringing of Ireland back to tillage, for land purchase is doubtless dead. Neither England nor Ireland will have any money for land purchase after this war. The

IRELAND

money will go into industry and for the wages of industrial workers. But by letting out the great grazing estates to groups of laborers, the productive power of Ireland will be increased.

There is no quick way through the tangle. The Irish question can be solved only by the people themselves. Can they create a good life for their community? Can they conduct a clean government? Can they release productive power in the nation, so that pauperism and ignorance and dissension will decrease? Can they lift clear of their past, forget injustice and misery, and establish a coöperative commonwealth? With the coming of autonomy Ireland will begin to face her real problem.

CHAPTER V

SOCIAL STUDIES

WHAT OF ENGLAND?

To feel the spirit of a nation at war is one thing and an easy thing. You can not help being caught into the current of their will and purpose. But to convey that spirit to your busy friends three thousand miles away is a much harder thing. I have been going around from man to man in England, trying to get just that phrase and summary which would make the British response clear to our people. Each one of these men, who has been good enough to pause in his war work to help me, has given a flash of the island spirit.

Lord Northcliffe said to me:

“No one will accuse me of failing to criticize the mistakes of the British army in the early months. But I want you to know that to-day we have the finest fighting-machine in the world. It has taken time to build it, but now we have it. Tell your people that.”

SOCIAL STUDIES

Viscount Bryce said to me:

“The British people are unanimous as they have never been before.”

The police commissioner of Scotland Yard, in charge of the secret service, said to me:

“Have you noticed in talking with the pacifists how discouraged they seem? They have no sense of a growing movement. They are disheartened because the great mass of the British people are not supporting them.” Then he turned to his telephone and gave instructions to call up Portsmouth and find out the time of arrival of the hospital-ship. His wounded son was due home from France.

G. K. Chesterton said to me:

“Democracy is on the march.” His brother is a private in the ranks.

Lloyd-George talked with me of the welfare work carried on for the ministry of munitions by Seebohm Rowntree, who has turned from his own factories of six thousand workers to care for the health of a million government employees.

“Here,” said Lloyd-George, “is the greatest attempt ever made by a government to surround the lives of the workers with safeguards for their

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

health and well-being. And it was the making of munitions that brought us to it. It was war and shells. It is always true that humanity has to descend into hell in order to rise again the third day. It is only through hell that it can achieve its resurrection."

But not all these distinguished men together have quite revealed the central flame, and then suddenly it was shown to me by a girl. She is a wage-earner in London, and every day on her way to her office she passes Fishmongers' Hall by London Bridge. This ancient place has been converted into a military hospital. To the house surgeon she wrote this letter:

Dear Sir, I am taking the liberty to write to you to ask if it is true that often a soldier's wound could be the easier and the better healed were there plenty of skin available to graft on to the wound? I have been told that many wounds are badly healed because the doctors cannot get skin. If this is so, I would consider it an honor to be allowed to put myself at your disposal at any time in order that my skin might be taken to graft on to a wound; I am prepared to give as much as would be practicable to take from me.

This is no impulsive movement on my part. I am obliged to come to town each day to earn my own liv-

SOCIAL STUDIES

ing, and am therefore debarred from working for the soldiers as other girls of my own age are doing. I have two brothers fighting, and for their sakes I feel I must do something. I am writing to your hospital because I know of nowhere else; if you can find no use for my services I shall be obliged if you will kindly inform me where I could go.

WHY THEY WILL WIN

England is at war *en masse*, and the proof of it is not that she has raised an army. Any country can raise an army if it has to. The proof of it is that she has changed a cherished habit. That means a spiritual change. It is a lot harder to break up a habit than it is to fight an enemy. The fact that two million persons are saving money to give to the Government for carrying on the war is the clearest single proof that the English nation is at war. By temperament the English are a colonizing, adventurous people. That means they are an open-handed people, to whom the careful ways of thrift are distasteful. Then, too, they are a race of individualists, doing what they like with their own—a race to whom collective effort is a bore. But they violated their instinct in order to win this war. For the English

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

were free spenders, and it revealed more devotion in them to raise two hundred million dollars in individual subscriptions than it did to raise five million men in recruiting.

One has to show the English effort in these broken bits and flashes rather than by any one overmastering display. That is because England is a tangled, self-willed democracy, of a vast variety of purpose. But when England began to alter its life, to sacrifice what was precious and ancient, then it became clear that she had committed herself beyond recall, that she was moving to an end beyond defeat.

The appeal for war savings was a general appeal made to all classes of the country. It put money into the hands of the Government with which to wage war. That money is spent for production by the nation instead of being spent for consumption by the individual person. The terms of the arrangement gave to the "saver" security, an excellent rate of interest, and the opportunity of withdrawal at any time. This use of money frees labor from "luxury" work to necessary work. The man grooves a big gun instead of pulling candy. The woman makes

SOCIAL STUDIES

shells instead of fancy waists. This release of labor concentrates the national effort on the work of victory instead of leaving the workers dispersed among parasitic trades.

The heart of the war-savings scheme is this: you buy a "war-savings certificate" for fifteen shillings and sixpence. In five years the Government will give you a pound for it. Less than four dollars has become five dollars. Of course the worker cannot make an investment of fifteen shillings and sixpence at one time. So he joins an association in his school, factory, store, or club, and subscribes his penny or sixpence each week. These associations are like our fraternal organizations. They appeal to the social sense of the group. There are other forms of war saving, such as exchequer bonds, but this system of certificate is the popular way. It is coöperative investment.

If the person does not belong to an association, he receives a war-savings card, with thirty-one spaces on it, each for a sixpenny stamp. He buys the stamps at the post-office as often as he can. When the card is full, he hands it in, and receives a certificate, worth fifteen shillings

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

and sixpence, and good for a pound at the end of five years.

Such speakers as Lennox Gilmour of the national war-savings committee go around the country addressing men and women in factories, and boys and girls in schools. This is one of the stories used by Mr. Gilmour in his campaign:

“I met in a railway carriage a man who had just returned from the front. He was a member of the Army Service Corps, and I got into conversation with him. In the course of our talk he said:

“‘I am one of those chaps that always like to prove what I say. Would you mind looking at my pay-book.’

“This in support of some assertion he had made. I replied that I should be delighted, and I looked at his pay-book. The last entry was three hundred francs, which he had drawn for his holiday; and immediately in front of that there was an entry, ‘War-savings certificates £10 1s. 6d.,’ which is the price of thirteen war-savings certificates.

“I said, ‘I see you have some of these war-savings certificates.’

SOCIAL STUDIES

“ ‘Yes, and I am going to get some more.’

“ ‘How did you get these?’

“ ‘Well,’ he said, ‘we get them in the squadron.’

“ ‘Did any other chaps get them?’

“ ‘Oh, yes, they did.’

“ I said, ‘How did your squadron do?’

“ ‘Well,’ he said, ‘my squadron—it was given out on parade that it was the backbone of the whole lot.’

“ ‘What,’ I asked, ‘does that mean?’

“ ‘Well,’ he said, ‘I will tell you. There are five squadrons in our base camp, and mine did the best of the lot.’

“ ‘What did it do?’

“ ‘There are,’ he said, ‘a hundred and fifty men in a squadron, and we contributed £2239.’

“ ‘What,’ I asked, ‘did the other four squadrons do?’

“ He laughed. ‘They did £200 among them.’

“ ‘Well,’ I said, ‘there is always an explanation for everything. Why did your squadron do so well, and why did the other squadrons do so poorly?’

“ ‘You see,’ he replied, ‘our major was keen,

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

and he spoke to every one of us and told us what we ought to do.'

"I asked, 'And the other majors, what did they do?'

"They handed out the leaflets.' "

That is the secret of the success which has attended this evangelistic campaign. It is the personal appeal, friend speaking to friend. And the motive for giving is rendered in the headlines of the pamphlets and posters: "Save for England." "Save for your country."

In North Nibley, one of the smallest villages in Gloucestershire, the inhabitants subscribed eighty dollars in a fortnight.

Wigstan Magna, in Leicestershire, is in the center of the hosiery and boot-making district. One of the factories has between three hundred and four hundred operatives. That factory purchased two hundred certificates in one week.

Yarmouth has fifty associations and four thousand members, and has subscribed ten thousand dollars. This city lies on the east coast, where the Zeppelins have stimulated the civilian consciousness.

It was out from Grimsby where the fishing-

SOCIAL STUDIES

trawlers have been lost by mines and submarines. The answer of Grimsby was made by seventy-three war-savings associations. In one week 4600 certificates were purchased.

At an East End factory in London 123 girls joined the savings crusade in a single week. Only two girls are not members. In three months the girls saved over \$250. They did it by chipping in their threepenny and sixpenny bit each week.

Norwich paid into the post-office \$75,000 in six weeks.

The boot and shoe operatives of Northampton are subscribing five thousand dollars a week.

Keithley, in Yorkshire, is the heart of the woolen trade. It makes uniforms for the Russian army. It saves five thousand dollars a week, an average of six shillings and eightpence for every inhabitant.

The domestic servants of Gillingham in Kent have united in a war-savings association. This reminds me of the touching gift of ten shillings which I once received from an English house-maid for ambulance work in Belgium. Let no one doubt the spirit in which this money of hum-

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

ble persons is given. It is given because a little nation was crushed, and because their brothers and lovers are fighting to free that little nation. No high-blown dreams of empire, no lust for territory, no desire for power and wealth, are in these obscure gifts. They are conscience-money to Belgium. They are the pitiful earnings of a democracy passed over to a suffering people.

In Plymouth, with its docking and shipping trade, eighteen thousand persons began to save in one week.

At Preston, in Lancashire, \$100,000 was turned over to the Government by the workers in the period of four months.

There is an elementary school for 350 boys near Newcastle. The boys brought in four thousand dollars from their families in eight weeks, and then kept up the average of five hundred dollars a week.

In Battersea one of the school-boys brought in the sum of five hundred dollars in pennies collected among the three hundred boys and their working families in ten months.

The thing that irritates us about England is

SOCIAL STUDIES

the same thing that offends us at home. Here is no well-oiled autocracy that runs on a single track to a visible goal. Instead of that clean, smooth, organized, docile affair, it is a democracy, with an immensely rich variety of life sprawling all over the place. The air is full of voices, because every one is allowed to speak. If you don't like it, remember what it is that you don't like: it is a free people, choosing to make its own mistakes, living its own life, and just now out on the war-path to chase some trespassers off the premises. Doubtless, if the critics were running the performance, they would give a more unified and polished proceeding. But no group of persons are running this war. The people are running it. So, instead of losing strength as the pressure increases, they gather force and momentum with each mistake. They teach themselves by failure. The will of the great German general staff can be snapped by defeat, because the staff is a handful of men. But the will of 45,000,000 people can not be broken, because it is the will of these school-boys and working-girls, of domestic servants and munition-workers, of a democracy whose sense of pity and justice has

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

been touched. The mistake in estimating the English effort is to measure it at any given time, because it is a continually growing effort. It is like a gathering of waters from mountain streams and the drift of hills and from inexhaustible rains. The confluence keeps widening and deepening from a thousand tributaries. The pool can be emptied, and soon it is not only filled again, but is larger than before.

The English are a “sentimental nation.” I quote a distinguished English officer when I say that, Captain Basil Williams. It is true. They are as sentimental as Americans. An appeal to cold reason, to personal aggrandizement, to a rainy day, or to a shadowy future, does not move them in the slightest. But something that concerns the welfare of helpless children or of persons whom they love releases all that is best in the English race. I know this, because I worked in a Red Cross London office in the early weeks of the war, and I found that the smallest appeal to the English public for help in clothing Belgians brought in a large response—a response, in fact, so overwhelming that it stuffed the office

SOCIAL STUDIES

rooms with supplies. Personally I have never dealt with a public that is so swiftly generous. When the full facts of Belgian relief are made public, it will be found that it is the English who have fed them and sheltered them, raised the greater part of the money, widened and adjusted their own home life in order to absorb an army of refugees, and steadily continued to provide funds without spurts and without fatigue. No better proof of this racial sentiment and kindness can be had than by studying a few of the fifty-four million posters and leaflets of recruiting, and the hundreds of thousand publications for war saving. The appeal is rarely to self-interest. The appeal is to the heart, to the great objects of the war, the ideal of liberty, the cause of freedom. This national saving is not being done by obscure, hard-working Englishmen and English-women to make their own old age cozy. It is being done to free Belgium and strengthen democracy. If the evangelists who have gone about Britain preaching war savings had spoken to a commercial motive, they would have whistled in vain.

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

DRAGONS' TEETH

England is developing a set of problems at lightning speed that will require a generation to uncoil. I can only indicate them. It would fill another volume even to state them in detail.

The first attempt to treat comprehensively the new machinery and buildings created by war needs has been made by the annual "Engineering Supplement" of "The Times." What is to be done with this new plant? has been the question asked by many, and answered by none. Mr. Hodge, the minister of labor, states that seventy-five million dollars of new capital has been expended in the extension of plant in the iron and steel trade. He estimates that by the end of the war the sum will be one hundred and fifty millions. He says: "I don't care whether it is by tariffs, by prohibition, by bounty, or any other method, the plant in our country must be utilized." Private plants, numbering four thousand seven hundred, have greatly expanded. There are over ninety-five new national factories. The "Engineering Supplement" quotes one firm as prophesying "a reduction in the proportion of

SOCIAL STUDIES

three machines to one available for future use." A firm of marine engineers says that sixty per cent. of the new machines will have to be scrapped, because the tools are over-driven and worn out. But even these estimates leave from twenty-five to forty per cent. of the new machinery available, and this is an enormous expansion in productive capacity. Thus in one year armament firms introduced twenty-five hundred new machine tools. The large majority of engineering firms agree that these works, with their new machinery, will be used for the intensive manufacture of standardized articles. The assembling of parts at these central plants has established manufacturing practice in the use of gages, and created the conditions for standard and interchangeable manufacture. As one firm writes:

"In small tools—twist drills and milling cutters—we believe that by standardization and judicious publicity we may fill a large portion of the business held formerly by Germany and the United States."

One hundred thousand gages have been made in the technical institutes in the last eighteen

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

months. The gage standardizes the engineering industry, and enables it to produce on a vast scale a great variety of manufactured articles. Standardization is essential to low-cost manufacture and large output, and the establishment of standard is dependent on the accuracy of gages, defining specified dimensions of absolute magnitude, and limiting permissible variation.

A professional engineer writes:

Our locomotives differ only in relatively small details, excepting valve-gears. The main sizes of cylinders, piston-rods, connecting-rods, side-rods, crank axles differ only very slightly in the same class of engines. . . . Hundreds of various forms of 12-in. x 20-in. horizontal engines exist, differing only in a very small degree in the actual details that count in actual wear and tear and the life of the engine. Could not all these details be agreed and standardized? If a few more usual types of engines—marine, steam rollers, etc.—were standardized, quite a number of our present munition factories could be engaged in manufacturing connecting-rods and side-rods only, others the cylinders and pistons, others the valve-gears, etc.; and in busy areas, without much carting, whole engines could thus be assembled in special shops dealing with special engines to the great gain of our home, colonial, and foreign customers. A similar course is

SOCIAL STUDIES

demanded very specially for electrical machinery, fittings, and telephones.

The munition factories could further be used to great advantage in fostering and nursing the British production of agricultural machinery, at present sadly behindhand, and manufacturing it as standard repetition work. They would also be suitable for making improved machine tools, as well as mining tools, such as rock-drills, etc.; and standard ships would be greatly improved if fitted not only with the standard engines already mentioned, but also standard winches, pumps, steering-gear, refrigerating-apparatus, etc.

The output in the engineering trade can be increased at least twenty-five per cent., even with the machinery that existed before the war, and with the new machinery that percentage will go considerably higher.

Inevitably standardization leads to organization and the creation of combines or trusts. Motor-car makers suggest the use of the great new plants for the purpose of producing cheap cars to compete with those of American make. Already efforts are being made to bring about a combination of British makers.

But it is not alone in the engineering trades that trusts are likely to be formed. Already

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

capital is concentrating in other industries. Lord Rhondda purchased a group of Welsh collieries, and the "Welsh Outlook" reports:

Lord Rhondda now controls over $3\frac{1}{2}$ millions of capital [pounds, not dollars], pays $2\frac{1}{2}$ millions in wages every year, and is virtually the dictator of the economic destiny of a quarter of a million miners. Rumors are also current that Lord Rhondda is extending his control over the press of Wales.

To control such vast, irresponsible economic power as his will be the task of Parliament; but here we meet with a new war-created problem. During the war Parliament has largely lost its control over government, which is administered to-day by a temporary group of lawyers, financiers, and imperialists, surrounded by a larger group of permanent expert officials. And this group in turn is enlarged by a small army of volunteer social workers. Not only do these hidden experts administer government, but they create new legislation. As a government investigator reports:

The change in the mode of industrial legislation may be summed up as a tendency to move from the politician towards the expert.

SOCIAL STUDIES

Even before the war men were saying: "The political machine of to-day presupposes that popular opinion shall have no initiative. Officialdom increases at the expense of the remaining social classes."

This is a tendency in the direction of bureaucracy, and the value of it rests in the intelligence and character of these inner manipulators and their responsiveness to public need. A parliamentary committee sits on its bill of recommendations, like a hen on its nest, and rises with a cackle. Sometimes the product, when hatched, is as distressing and unexpected as a duck's egg in the poultry farm. I suspect that the reconstruction committee and the franchise committee are going to find that their sober, well-rounded draft of recommendations will develop startling methods of locomotion. The law itself, hatched in the privacy of committee-rooms, sallies out with a special dynamic of its own.

We have lost all surprise that our correspondence should be pawed over before we see it, our houses invaded by competent or incompetent authorities and their representatives, our religion regulated or otherwise catechised.

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

So says one of the "Cambridge Magazine" group, who have retained their sanity in a war which temporarily unhinged H. G. Wells and Arnold Bennett, and lifted Austin Harrison, St. Loe Strachey, Leo Maxse, Gwynne, Horatio Bottomley, Robert Blatchford, and Northcliffe into leadership of public opinion. To these creators of constructive thought, "out to beat the Boches," such a question as "Who shall guard the guardians?" is academic in "a world of blood and iron, controlled by men who do not take what they would call a Sunday-school view," as the realist editor of the "Spectator" writes.

But Parliament was at least an honest attempt to give the people a check on the behavior of the men in power. And now this inside clique has taken away Parliament, and no one knows where they have secreted it. When it has been discovered and restored, it will have still other problems with which to wrestle.

How are the three thousand million pounds of national debt to be paid for? Indirect taxation means high prices on food and clothing, a high cost of living. Taxation of income, death duties, conscription of profits, is "class legisla-

SOCIAL STUDIES

tion." The only final way out here is of course to add to taxation increased production. A man pays his debts by successful work not alone by manipulating the market, but mainly by providing it with commodities.

But meanwhile high wages and high prices are leading to a demand for protection. England is talking of coming over on the good old McKinley American basis. The ancient battle-ground of tariff reform is going to be churned into dust and heat. For a growing group of Tories, reinforced by converts, like the new minister of labor, are finding the source of all economic weakness in free trade. A convenient, one-phrase summary solution of a complex matter is always appreciated by men who don't enjoy the process of organizing thought. This is no sudden conversion for a portion of the Tories. Disraeli held that "the ultimate aim of the Free Trader was to govern England in the interest of the Industrialist," as Butler points out in his able study of "The Tory Tradition." "I wish," said Disraeli, "to see our national prosperity upheld alike by a skilful agriculture and by an extended commerce."

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

That “alike” to be effective would require some of the same magic which Joshua used on the setting sun, for England is an industrial country. But Disraeli and many of the later Tory protectionists acted from long-held conviction. Whereas there is a touch of extempore when Mr. Hodge, the new minister of labor, intoxicated by his association with peers of the realm, cries out in Pisgah vision that England is done with free trade. At least it will pay him to study the happy industrial proletariat in Fall River, Lawrence, and our other protected cities before he turns to tariff reform as the sole salvation of a country that requires immense quantities of raw material.

This is the danger which England faces, that her leaders will run after panaceas of protection, business government, scientific management, instead of dealing with what is the heart of each one of her problems—human relationship.

CHANGE

At the Labor party conference in Manchester in the first month of 1917 one of the leaders said:

If the soldier was worth two pounds a week when he

SOCIAL STUDIES

was destroying things, was he not worth two pounds when he was producing? A country which can find millions of "quids" to feed the cannon's mouth can find millions to feed the worker's mouth.

The other day I was sitting at luncheon with the mayor of one of the great English cities. He said to me:

Never again will there be the cry of "No money to spend." A thousand million for war, and you haggle over twenty millions for education? Give us education. Continue the high wages. Don't knock off the war bonuses. Make them permanent. Pay unskilled labor a minimum of thirty shillings, and later raise it to two pounds. We don't need to worry about the skilled trade-unionists. Let them fight for their three and four pounds. There will be no trouble after the war. Labor will obtain its demands. Wages can't be lowered. The workers won't let them.

That is one of the new ideas brought into English life by the war: there must be a better use of money and a wider distribution of it than in the past. This idea will be applied, for instance, to the care of motherhood and child welfare. At the maternity centers one has now the spectacle of the state keeping the mother and child alive, but under-nourished. If the state is to intervene

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

at all, it must do so vigorously. Otherwise the cost of intervention, which is paid for by taxation, fails to result in a sturdy race, paying back the subsidy by production. There is a phrase in golf about following through the stroke. It admirably expresses the thoroughness that is needed in social reform.

That imperial and foreign policy concerns the individual worker, and can make him prosperous or uncomfortable, is another idea which the war has brought to the British mind. Imperial policy, which by its very nature is democratic, is itself a foreign policy. When you shovel together free nations, which are a belt around the world, you have necessarily established a series of contacts with backward races, subject peoples, and imperfect democracies. The domestic policy must be influenced by the foreign policy. As an instance, one of the first matters to be taken up by the British imperial conference will be that of Ireland. The recoil of this on foreign policy will be powerful. It will clear the air for an Anglo-American understanding. Great Britain, in accepting the idea of a British commonwealth,

SOCIAL STUDIES

has in reality extended the principle of democratic control to foreign policy. This means a lessening of secret diplomacy. It is a coherent, thoughtful, and determined effort to put into execution the excellent desires which The Hague Conference stimulated, but did not make effective. One of the duties of a modern nation is to induce its citizens to exercise the responsibilities which they in reality possess, but do not care to acknowledge. It has required a preliminary course of education to accustom the British dominions to the idea that they were concerned with foreign policy. By groups of informal conference, by much excellent pamphleteering in "The Round Table," by all sorts of books, articles, and talks from Cromer, Milner, Lionel Curtis, P. H. Kerr, Ray Lankester, and Woolf, the responsibilities of the British state have been emphasized. The pressure of the war has served to accelerate a tendency of thought that was already in operation. In fact, none of these ideas is really new. All have been familiar to thinkers for a number of years, but there is never any large number of thinkers loose on this planet at

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

any one moment. So it takes time for thought to shake down among the people, and finally to reach an application in government.

As these ideas spread, the British public is beginning to keep a close tab on its leaders. It insists that they be representative, and when they take a side-track, the democracy cuts loose and leaves them lonely. The war has given us three instances of this in Hughes of Australia, John Redmond, and Mrs. Pankhurst. Mr. Hughes was elected premier of Australia to represent a democratic community in terms of social legislation and administration. He sailed to England, became inoculated with the belief that he was a war-lord, advocated at the Paris conference a trade boycott, which would have isolated England from the markets of the world more effectually than a shoal of submarines, and finally, fed by flattery, swelled to the rôle of dictator and declared for conscription. His home people voted him down, some of his cabinet resigned, and to-day he is a minority premier. "Stick to your last" is the meaning of the swift trouncing which the Australian democracy gave him.

John Redmond is head of the Irish National-

SOCIAL STUDIES

ists, but he no longer represents young Ireland. And the reason is that, in a burst of parliamentary fervor, he pledged Ireland to the cause of the Allies. That was not for him to do. He was sent to Westminster to push through Home Rule, not to coöperate with Downing Street in foreign policy. The Irish people refused to be picked up in his right hand and set down in the trenches.

When war broke out Mrs. Pankhurst dropped her militant campaign and went out recruiting. Ever since then she has watched the Balkan developments, pounded Lord Grey, urged a fight to a finish. She not only dropped her militant campaign; she dropped the woman question. She no longer follows social legislation, the woman's wage, hours of over-time. But she was a leader precisely because of the woman question; so her following has dropped away, and she is no longer ranked by the women reformers as one of the general staff. Thus the organ of the women trade-unionists, "The Woman Worker," writes a "message that might have come" from Mrs. Pankhurst:

"I desire to inform members of the Federation

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

that in my view their duty should be to march in as many processions, create as much disturbance, and take as many collections as possible." And there is a more deadly home-thrust than that. Her own daughter, Sylvia Pankhurst, has gone on with the work of social reform for women, and to-day has a strong following. There is another reason why Mrs. Pankhurst has lost her following, and this is that her following have undergone a psychological change; but of that I will speak later. What concerns me here is that Mrs. Pankhurst abandoned the woman's movement for the national cause, and that in doing this she lost control of her part of the woman's movement.

I am not engaged here in debating the question whether Mr. Hughes was not correct in urging conscription, whether Mr. Redmond was not far-sighted in pledging Ireland, and whether Mrs. Pankhurst was not patriotic in subordinating women workers to soldiers. I am only saying that they did not represent their constituency, and in taking the new tack they lost their following. What the democracy is learning to say to its leaders is, "Represent us or get out." I don't see in these manifestations of the popular wish

SOCIAL STUDIES

any new idea, but I do see a swifter and more sensitive application of the principle of democratic control. Leaders remain leaders only as long as they are channels for the collective will.

Another change I feel in English life is an emotional change. It is the disappearance of the hysteria that was caused by suppression. I don't refer to the orgiastic elements in the English nature that are revealed at the corner public house and on Bank holiday. These are the periodic explosions of the natural man. It was inevitable that England should have created the Salvation Army and indulged in Mafeking Night. The normal Englishman is a free, noisy creature, who talks by the hour, interrupts public meetings, and lives as a human being should. Any one who does n't know that has never spent evenings in country inns, and has never traveled in a third-class compartment. The English worker is a sociable person. Nor am I referring to the upper class, which has spread its governors, explorers, and sportsmen over the earth, and whose women ride to hounds, drive ambulances under the guns, and speed up the suffrage campaign.

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

I am speaking of the English middle class, the forlornest middle class known to me. France and America have nothing like it. The suppression of emotional life in the women—the creation of the pose of “good form,” the severely reticent lady, neither heard nor even seen in public—has resulted in a rather wide-spread hysteria in that one stratum of the community, the middle-class layer. These women are desirous to be true to type, to do nothing that is not correct, and the result has been a prim and regulated life, full of negations, with the instinctive impulses and desires of a free, creative life left out of the reckoning. Nature punishes this suppression with nervous maladies. One London specialist told me he knew of several hundred such cases.

This hysteria was shown in manifestations of the militant suffrage movement. I am not speaking of the leaders. Mrs. Pankhurst is a very charming woman, of determined will and well-balanced mentality, who adopted a program of action because she believed she was forced to it by the demands of the situation. Mrs. “General” Drummond is the most delightful humorist, with the exception of Chesterton, whom I have

SOCIAL STUDIES

ever met. She is luminously sane. My wife and I spent three days with her at Havre, and she held us through the evenings till midnight with her reminiscences of carrying a hansom-cab into the House of Commons, floating in a tug down the Thames past Parliament, and addressing the statesmen on the Embankment, who had to sit and listen because they were chained to their afternoon tea. Another time she was in the gallery of a crowded public hall and, in trying to go out, became entangled in the pedals of the organ, and sent out wailing notes. Miss Kenney is a modest, earnest young woman of clear, idealistic purpose. This handful of leaders who manipulated the Women's Social and Political Union are expressing themselves. But the movement attracted an element in the middle class which is in spiritual bondage, and some of these showed signs of hysteria in their response. The bitterness of tone in the books of certain English women writers is another indication of suffering.

To all such victims of suppressed vitality, leading to anxiety, melancholy, and hysteria, the war has come as a release, for it has given them excit-

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

ing occupation. They have entered industry, commerce, government employment. They have nursed soldiers, cooked at canteens, and become a part of the great communal life flowing past them.

These minor changes of idea and attitude and emotional response are all a part of the great change which has come over England. Life is no longer a monopoly possession of the upper classes, of the male sex, of the mother country, of the Westminster Parliament, of the captains of industry. Life is not a matter to be postponed to the hereafter and the choir invisible. It is the product here and now of one's will and energy, fed by impulse, and shaped by thought. One-self is the person concerned, and the happiest society in which to feel at home is a democracy of equals.

A BATCH OF PAPERS

Instead of being ponderous and exhaustive, and writing this like a sociological report, I shall tell what I like and dislike about British journalism, and we shall get along faster than by the heavy-footed way. I like Chesterton's paper,

SOCIAL STUDIES

“The New Witness,” since G. K. C. has taken it over. Others that write his style annoy me, as an echo in the auditorium annoys an audience who want to hear the speaker himself. I like “The New Witness” because Gilbert K. Chesterton seems to me the best thing England has produced since Dickens. I like the things he believes in, and I hate sociological experts and prohibitionists and Uhlan officers, which are the things he hates. I feel in him that a very honest man is speaking, so I am glad of his views even when I differ with him. He is a useful corrective on public opinion, too. He dislikes the servile state, by which he means the coming orderly, regimented Utopia, scientifically managed by Sidney Webb. That is the kind of talk we need, because all of us in social work (and who is n’t a social worker to-day?) are forever hunting and harrying the poor, itemizing their food-supply, shading off just the proportion of caloric difference between starvation and under-nourishment. And when we catch the line where the poor satisfy us that they can pull through, we are going to impale them with a minimum wage. I like his impudence to Northcliffe, because Northcliffe

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

is a dangerous sort of man in a modern democracy. He is dangerous because he does so much good; but I will get around to him in a moment. As a journalist Chesterton gets only about a quarter of himself into action. But even a quarter of Chesterton is good measure. He leaves out all his overtones, the lilting verse and jolly stories and incomparable essays, those flashes of good criticism and exultation. He works very hard at his journalism. That is why he does n't do it so well as his careless things, which give him fun. But for all that there is no other editorial page in England or the United States written with the snap, wit, and honest humanity of his paragraphs. I hope he won't blunt himself by overwork. It would be an international loss if that sane, jolly mind is bent to routine. England has need of him. There is something cosmic about English plans of reconstruction, something of the weary load of destiny about their imperial commonwealth. It is a pleasant thing to be able to remind ourselves that the same race that produced Curzon and Milner and Carson, heavy men, with a sense of predestined seriousness, after all produced Chesterton.

SOCIAL STUDIES

I have to jump the Irish Sea in order to find anything so much in earnest and gay as the "New Witness" in these months of management by one who tells me that he is "the world's worst editor." I think the independent spirited little Irish weeklies are admirable. They sass the censor and the lord lieutenant and the Castle. I met some of the editors, poor men and honest, editing and writing papers in which they believe. They seemed to me worth all the sleek, timid New York crowd put together. They speak their heart out, then take the galley proof around to the censor, and he slashes out "seditious" paragraphs, and they publish about half their heartful. I have seen these carved-up galleys and the pleading, warning, threatening letters of the censor. These journalists are pretty much everything in their shop—editor and contributor and proof-reader and office boy—because their papers are often one-man concerns. A man believes something hard, and being Irish, he has the knack of statement, so he publishes a paper. One of them told us he had a weekly circulation of 10,000; another had 6000. These weeklies have literary quality. One of them,

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

“New Ireland,” is stuffed full of good things by A. E., James Stephens, Katharine Tynan, and the rest of that gifted group. There is something pathetic about the editors I am speaking of; I met several of them. I don’t mean pitiable, because you don’t pity men who are better than you are. But there seemed something hopeless about the success of their efforts within any span of time that would concern them at all. I suppose it is just an extension of the feeling that we have about any clean, unrewarded effort in this present world of ours where men of the sort of these Irish editors, with fine hopes about humanity in their heart, go lean and tired to their grave. Some of them are already in prison, and more of them will be there before the Irish question is well settled.

Coming back to England, one has to have “The Nation.” It is much like our own “New Republic.” But what is a discovery in “The New Republic” becomes a formula in “The Nation.” “The New Republic” is cock-sure, omniscient, and “I’m not arguing with you; I’m telling you,” because its background is scanty, and it has the freshness of a virgin mind. “The Nation” is

SOCIAL STUDIES

all background, and so is a little weary. It has the slightly fatigued mind of one who has lived a lifetime with the noble aspirations of our better-class radicals, and needs a change, but won't take it. I have read "The Nation" since 1908, and I never felt this ennui so much as during these war months. Like many other radicals, it was caught between the Zeppelins and the submarines without a program. It had nothing to say, and said it. Latterly it has had a rebirth. Bertrand Russell published a fascinating book a few months ago, called "Why Men Fight." I have been watching that book seep out through the pores of "The Nation" ever since. "The Nation" makes me tired because its sincerity is stale; but, for all that, it is one of the best weeklies in England, and it comes closer to interpreting the vital thought of England, the currents of tendency, than any paper known to me. Only I wish it were not so languid in telling about vital thought. It is of course well written, a quality it shares with forty other papers. That gift of a good working style is rather widespread. It comes of having a literary tradition and a well-read university crowd. There must

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

be two or three hundred men in England with a clear and satisfactory technic.

Speaking of the "New Republic," Leo Maxse of "The National Review" and Massingham of "The Nation" unite in quoting from it. Men like Lord Milner "see" it. Professor Graham Wallas said to me: "Walter Lippmann has a mind with an edge. He may well develop into a great democratic leader."

I was taught at Yale to regard "The Atheneum" as the authoritative paper of the English language in literary criticism, and having built that into my formative years, I can no more shake the belief than I can free myself of the idea that we are the home of the brave and the free. But I shall have to let it go at that, because I often escape from it to the clever and breezy opening paragraphs of "The Saturday Review." They state the news of the week in one hundred word summaries, which are equally charming on the death of a Greek professor and the rotten radicalism of modern thought. I like "The Saturday Review," "The National Review," and "The Morning Post" for an impotent hate which they have in common. I love to watch what psycho-

SOCIAL STUDIES

analysts term a “complex” uncoil itself periodically, and writhe around in the public eye. Each of them has a nest of complexes, and all have the same complexes. They hate Americans, Germans, labor, radicalism, and the Irish with a fine, fresh enthusiasm, which results in lively writing. In this bad modern world they have lost their public, and they see their future trailed out behind them like a foamy wake, but they go into dissolution with a zest. The war has partly spoiled their pleasure, because German misdeeds gave them a legitimate and a popular object of attack, and for a time they had to endure a certain measure of public favor, as men who had told you so. But as the Irish question approaches settlement, as labor takes control of a new province every month, and as radicalism honeycombs the British commonwealth, they are regaining their ancient rôle of Cassandra.

To talk of English weekly journalism and omit Horatio Bottomley and his “John Bull” would be as unfortunate as dropping George Cohan and Billy Sunday from a list of leaders of American thought. Very simply Bottomley said recently:

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

I speak as the editor of a journal which enjoys a circulation and wields an influence unique in newspaper history; and as one who, for good or evil, has gained the ear and the confidence of a sufficient section of the British public to make or unmake Ministers.

Stated with true British restraint, that is a minimum appraisal of the place Bottomley holds in public esteem. In the same issue Lloyd-George learns he is not to be broken at the first kick-off. "So long as he does this—but not a day longer—he may rely, for what it may be worth, upon my unqualified and disinterested support." I heard a British colonel say the other day that Bottomley should have been in the cabinet. He writes a picture-post-card style, like that of Arthur Brisbane, which is spotted with battle-cries and catch-phrases such as "a business Government," "Germany's Death-rattle." He is really funny in a way that "Punch" would like to be. He has a genuine pity for the lot of the poor, and I think in that, and not in his raw conceit and vulgarity and barrenness of ideas, lies the secret of his hold on a portion of the people. When it comes to the downright spade-work of reconstruction, where bright

SOCIAL STUDIES

phrases are not a substitute for hard thinking, I foresee a sharp tussle for mastery between the Bottomley type of mind and the real leaders of England. Surely the real leaders are men like Seebohm Rowntree, Zimmern, Lionel Curtis, and Prothero, who put fundamental brain-work on the industrial and imperial problems. Meanwhile I read "John Bull," and so does England.

There is no wrench in passing from Bottomley to Lord Northcliffe. Both are "practical men," who want things done now. Northcliffe is a big, genial man, carrying a sense of immediate power. He suggested to me a cross between a district leader and a captain of industry. He will do anything for you personally, like a Tammany boss. It gives him a sense of his own power, and it expresses a genuine human liking in his make-up. He cuts across lots to get into action. He writes well, talks well, and has a hard horse sense that has served England in the present crisis. Whether he will continue to be of value will depend on his ability to broaden his vision of the industrial struggle. He has the arrogance of men who make swift decisions, and who are in the position to carry them out. He has a sharpened

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

sense of reality, but it is a materialistic sense. Whether he will help the new world after the war is a question that is troubling all who have watched his astonishing career and realize his force. There is a danger of England too hastily reshaping its ideals. Because it has been slow and unorganized it is turning to American and Prussian methods. But it will be a loss if it lets in the whole materialistic philosophy of results, success, and efficiency. And just here is the damage of a man like Northcliffe, because he is a sort of Prussian superman, who is death on slackness, but blind to any meaning that can't be caught inside of three dimensions. There was a restraint in English journalism before his time. I noticed the other day that he published in his "Daily Mail" a cartoon of Raemaekers, and used an underline which made it seem that Raemaekers had drawn his picture in order to throw scorn on Viscount Grey. Actually the caption had been faked in the office to serve the political ends of the paper. That is dirty journalism, as dirty as America's Yellow Press. I am not trying to offer wise conclusions in this chapter. I am only recording impressions after many years of daily

SOCIAL STUDIES

reading in the English press. So I leave Northcliffe with no formulated opinion. I see valuable service in his hard hitting, but I distrust something in the man which I feel to be ruthless and unmoral. It seems to me un-English, or else I am all wrong about the temperateness and kindness of English character.

“The Manchester *Guardian*” is one of the best newspapers in England. To praise its editorials, its dramatic reviews, its balance of news, its judicial, and yet spirited, attitude to custom and change, is what President Hadley tersely calls “a work of supererogation.” It is as good as an amalgam of “The Springfield Republican,” “The Kansas City Star,” and “The Dallas News.”

“The Westminster *Gazette*” has a delightful literary department where they turn English verses into decasyllabic Latin, develop the capabilities of words whose initial letter is z, and write tiny essays on “How to Enter an Omnibus.”

A. G. Gardiner writes political studies and character sketches in his “*Daily News*” that remind an American of Colonel Watterson’s best work.

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

I have grown very weary of J. L. Garvin in the Sunday "Observer." He has felt the necessity of "putting a punch" into it every week till he writes portentously of "tanks," which should be left for Chesterton, and of the map of Europe, which is the vested interest of Hilaire Belloc.

The best writers of Great Britain sprinkle themselves about on the editorial pages in a way that makes the breakfast paper a voyage of discovery. The "New Statesman," the "New Age," and the "Cambridge Magazine," with its amazing digest of foreign opinion, are quite irreplaceable because no other periodicals fulfill their function. I used to read the "Spectator," till Strachey's militancy in several fields grew wearisome.

The individualistic penny weeklies and monthlies are unfailingly bright. It seems strange to me that we have nothing of the sort in America. The suffrage papers; the one-man affairs, like George Lansbury's "Herald" and Sorollea's "Everyman"; "The British Weekly," with its excellent literary letter by Robertson Nicoll; "The Christian Commonwealth," with its analysis of labor conditions and of advanced Nonconformist

SOCIAL STUDIES

thought—all combine to give the impression of a self-conscious public opinion fed and renewed by the free play of the individualistic mind.

Of the heavier reviews, "The Fortnightly," "Nineteenth Century" and "The Contemporary" are valuable for obtaining that sweep of international affairs of which we in America catch hardly a glimpse in our popular magazines.

But the best of the reviews is "The Round Table." Men like Lionel Curtis and A. E. Zimmern are working here at the principles of reconstruction for industry and the empire. It is solid, close-wrought work, wrestling at the problems of the modern world with an absence of theory and rhetoric. No other single publication has had the influence of "The Round Table" in directing British public opinion. "The Round Table" helped to prepare the ground for the changes which came through with the war. They and the Fabian group and the Workers' Educational Association and the workers themselves have between them sprung the most dramatic revolution in one hundred years, and it is still only in its faint beginnings.

Somebody is going to tell me that my list is n't

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

complete, and that I have omitted the most weighty, the most significant paper on the island. But this is not a catalogue, and it is not a guide to self-help. It is merely the record of the likes of one man who reads for pleasure. So let them bring forward their "Chamber's," "Hibbert Journal," "Quarterly Review," and "The Edinburgh," "Truth," "Cornhill," and "The New Age."

FREE SPEECH

One of our most prominent American social workers returned home the other day from a foreign tour. She was quoted as saying that she had found liberty suppressed everywhere. A moment later in the interview it appeared that her experience in England consisted in cutting across the island and jumping aboard her boat at Liverpool. That lets her out. If she had remained in England she would have found that liberty is a lively possession there just now. I have never before seen the "subject" act with so much initiative and I have never heard him express himself so vigorously. Mr. Bertrand Russell receives an excellent free advertisement from

SOCIAL STUDIES

the War Office for his views, and proceeds to state them in one of the best books written in recent years, "Why Men Fight." The book is widely advertised and favorably reviewed. In a time of incalculable strain half a dozen conscientious objectors are dealt with unjustly and shamefully while some thousands are dealt with honorably. And conscientious objectors are only two per cent. of the total number of claimants for exemption. These others are in "reserved trades," they are the "sole support" of a family, they have built up an individual business. And of all these cases, only four per cent. of the decisions have been appealed against. Conscientious objectors would never have been heard from if Parliament had not created their status. There are no conscientious objectors in Germany; there is the shooting-squad. It is only in a free country that liberty can "raise a rough house." England is a free country. There are plenty of criticisms that lie against her for mental sloth, for mistaken foreign policy, for unconscious and deep pride; but a man is still free to carry out his policy and speak his mind. The perfect proof is this: in the year

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

1915 she had 698 labor strikes. At once the vigilant critic of England will say, "The laboring man is not patriotic." Let me first point out that this is an exactly opposite charge from the charge that he has lost his personal liberty. Secondly, it is untrue. He is patriotic, but he feels no loyalty toward the profit-makers. The striking miners were accused of holding up coal from the navy and endangering the battle-ship fleet. But they showed figures to a friend of mine which proved the exact point to which they could proceed with their strike without lessening the source of supply for the navy. The worker is enough of a man to die for his country or work for it till he drops; but he does not care to be exploited by profiteers under the glib phrases of national service. The labor situation to-day is the proof that England is free.

But England has no publicity sense. She advertises all her blunders and crimes, and goes silent when she does well. The failure of Loos is publicly proclaimed. The Admiralty competes with the War Office in giving bad impressions of great things done. England allows freedom of speech in Hyde Park, in "The Herald," "Com-

SOCIAL STUDIES

mon Sense," "The Labor Leader," "The Nation," "Forward." She allows it to Ramsay MacDonald, Philip Snowden, Ponsonby, Trevelyan, Lowes Dickinson, Lansbury, Sylvia Pankhurst, and a hundred other voices and organs that continue the great tradition of personal liberty. But when she restricts one man from the munitions areas she uses a megaphone to tell the world that liberalism is dead. Wherever the War Office has stepped in and encroached on the liberty of the subject and the claims of private property, the civil courts have upheld the rights of the person against military necessity. A series of decisions in the last two years proves this. But all that England speaks of is the Defense of the Realm Act, as if a band of grim officers were yanking struggling civilians into penal servitude. When England has a choice offering that would win praise and sympathy, she puts a veil of silence between the attraction and the neutral public. To any one that understands England this is agreeable, because it is all a part of her muddling greatness. "Hands off her ancient liberties," and the hands are still off. But to an outsider the din of perennial, lively protest seems like the

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

wail of lost souls, a race sold to slavery. It has given a wrong impression to America, where it is not yet fully realized that the wealth of England and the industrial work of England are the sources of strength for the Allied cause, and that the Somme offensive is only the gentle prelude to the music that will tune up in Picardy this spring. And yet the Somme offensive sucked up the German forces from both fronts, let Italy and Russia smash ahead, and enabled France to shake the army corps from Verdun. The big guns and the shells of England's four thousand seven hundred controlled shops are the decisive factors of this war. A set of rather cocky German officers were led recently through the square miles of preparedness that lie back of the English lines. Their expression altered as the massed, detailed abundance of the blow that gathers there was unfolded before their trained eyes. Home was never like this.

Now, while it is a pity to puzzle us who are Americans, there is no serious harm in it. But the real demerit of putting the worst foot forward is that it misleads the enemy into thinking there is n't a big kick coming from the best foot

SOCIAL STUDIES

in the background. I am a peace-loving man, and in the interests of the German peasant and clerk I wish that Germany could have a picture of the English effort which is only in the first arc of its ascending curve. The Government would then withdraw its troops on all fronts, cede Alsace-Lorraine, sign indemnities, and thank their tribal deity for the easy terms of peace. The whole English effort is the spectacle of a democracy on the march. It is accompanied by grumbles and mistakes, and is as haphazard an affair as our first two years of Civil War; but back of the wasted motion is an inexhaustible strength.

The key of the whole performance is set by the British army and navy. No one has caught the essential note of the British fighting men. Mr. Kipling has a harsh and brutal way of rendering the affair. Because he is a man of genius, he creates his effect, he leaves his impression; but his is not an interpretation of the spirit of these men. Mr. Noyes has cast the drama on sea and land in an heroic Elizabethan key, but a modern democracy does not play up to his setting. It goes about things in its own way, tight-lipped in

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

suffering, and good-humored in bad weather. The War Office ought to turn some one loose among the million in Picardy who would really capture the extraordinary ensemble. O. Henry would have been the man for this job.

There has long been a slang phrase for a man who was going out for an evening of pleasure in the West End of London. When he wished to say that he was planning a jolly supper party and an evening at a music hall, he summed it up by saying he was "going west." The men at the front who tell of the death of a comrade say, "He has gone west."

The British Tommy throws a lugubrious exaggeration of shrapnel and flies and trench-mud into his songs, fills his chorus with expressions of a desire to go home, and sticks it at the Somme. As G. K. Chesterton said to me:

"The English people have never found their full expression in religion or poetry. It is in humor where the English nature comes through."

The popular Tommy attitude toward trench-life is that of "grousing," and no one has interpreted this so well as one of the men at the front, Captain Bruce Bairnsfather. He gives no mock

SOCIAL STUDIES

heroics about the glory of sacrifice. His sketches are a humorously disgusted record of water underfoot, rain overhead, barbed wire, sand-bags, and Bully beef. I doubt if any other nation in the moment of supreme strain would circulate his pamphlets by the hundred thousand as good recruiting material.

But England knows that if she quenched free speech she would lose the war. She would lose the war because she would be destroying the spirit of her men, which escapes the mud and scum of things by spattering them back with a jest.

Free speech is a fundamental requirement of English nature. The Englishman must speak his mind openly, register his "kick" against discomforts, and be "agin' the Government." With that clearance he settles down to steady work. No one knows what would happen if the nation were thoroughly muzzled. The attempt has never before been made. It has been made only in part in this war.

THE RIGHT OF ASYLUM

A couple of critics of these chapters on social change have said that I am too buoyant in render-

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

ing a painful process. The reconstruction is not going to be as easy as all that, they say. Unskilled labor is going to have the fight of its life. Women face a bitter two or three years. The forces of reaction have been strengthened by three years of militarism. The trade-unions have been shot to pieces by the concessions they have made under the munitions acts. The gains which cost them three generations to achieve have all been swept away and will never be restored. A large portion of the press has been nothing but the official organ for doctored news. Many hundreds of men are in jail because "Christianity has become punishable by ten years' penal servitude under the Military Service Act" (which is a pungent reference to conscientious objectors).

I have given a wrong impression if the reader thinks that the principle of democratic control is being established without a severe fight; but the point is that it is being established. When one has only a short time and limited space at disposal, it is hard to render a social change without either writing wordy surface generalizations or else getting messed up with details. Perhaps the simplest way of making clear that it has cost

SOCIAL STUDIES

suffering to win this freedom, and yet that the victory is being won, is to consider one application of democratic control in these years of stress.

I choose the “right of asylum” to prove my point that England still champions freedom. It is a fair choice, because the right of asylum rocked in the balance and nearly went under. It was violently assailed by the Scotland Yard police and the Government itself, but the English people rallied and saved it. The hounding of Russian political refugees in London, which has gone on under cover of “military necessity,” probably injured the English cause more severely in America in the early days than any other official blunder of the war. The news was spread broadcast among our social workers.

For centuries England has given her hospitality to exiles from other lands who had fled from tyranny. To her in time of persecution have come the Huguenots, Louis Kossuth, Mazzini, Karl Marx, Engels, Bakunin, Kropotkin, French Communards, and now for many years Russian refugees. As one of the peers in the House of Lords said:

It has been our boast for centuries that this coun-

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

try is a hospitable refuge for those who flee from other lands. At the time of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew in 1572 and of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, we were the refuge for the Huguenots. Victor Hugo came to Jersey to escape from the despotism of Napoleon III. Those who have sought a refuge here have been subject to the common law, answerable for their actions, but not for their opinions.

Under cover of the war the Scotland Yard police began to harass the Russian refugees in London. They attacked the Russian Seamen's Union. The Russian Seamen's Union exists to fight the conditions under which the Russian sailors work. It exposed "the beating of the men, their confinement in cages, their being put in chains, deprived of food, heavy fines, flogging." It concerned itself with the conditions of the ships and the low wages. By the Russian combination law the right to organize was denied to Russian seamen, so their union had to locate its center of activity in a foreign country, and chose Belgium. It was driven out from Antwerp in October of 1914 by the advance of the German army. It crossed to London. On December 20, 1915, the police of Scotland Yard raided the office of the union, and seized the documents, in-

SOCIAL STUDIES

cluding a list of persons in Russia with whom the union corresponded. At the same time the home of Dimitri Anitchkin, secretary of the union, was raided, and his manuscripts and letters for ten years back were confiscated. So heavy and far-reaching was the hand of authority that when the union appealed to the National Sailors and Firemen's Union of England, the general secretary, E. Cathery, wrote:

You must not forget you are a foreigner in a foreign country, although you belong to one of our allies ; but we have got to look after the interest of our country at present, and do not want any unpleasantness at the present time. Under the Defense of the Realm Act we can be called before the authorities for doing things we can do with freedom in normal times.

A little group of English people saw that the ancient right of asylum was about to be abolished. So they made their appeal to the British trade-unions. In "The Railway Review," "The Yorkshire Factory Times," "The Amalgamated Society of Engineers Journal," and "The Cotton Factory Times" they saw to it that articles of protest appeared.

But the police were determined that free

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

speech should not prevail. A labor conference was to be held in London on January 6, 1916, and a leaflet had been prepared, setting out the facts of the attack on the Russian refugees, and called an "Open Letter to Trade Unionists." Accordingly, on January 5, the police raided the headquarters of the "Russian Political Prisoners' and Exiles' Relief Committee," at 96 Lexham Gardens, Kensington, London. They seized one thousand copies of a financial report, containing the seditious information that the Woolwich trades council had given six pounds to the Russian committee, that the National Union of Railwaymen of Bletchley had given fourteen shillings, that the Independent Labor party of Tantobie had contributed eleven shillings and eightpence. Exhilarated by their success, the police proceeded to commandeer the reprints in leaflet form of the articles that had appeared in "The Railway Review," "The Yorkshire Factory Times," and "The Amalgamated Society of Engineers Journal." Nor did they overlook a thousand copies of the "Open Letter to Trade Unionists," which were to have been distributed on the next day.

SOCIAL STUDIES

The home secretary, Mr. Herbert Samuel, said to the House of Commons on July 11, 1916:

"Russians of military age settling in this country will, unless they prefer to return for military service in Russia, be required to enlist in the British army. The details of the scheme are now being worked out."

They were. The police set to work illegally and without due authority and said to the Russian refugees:

"You have to go back to Russia. Here is your ticket; you are to be at Euston Station on such and such a day."

Charles Sarno had come from Russia three years previously. An order was served upon him; he was to be deported to Russia. The order was challenged. When it came to argument the representatives of the crown abandoned the case. Immediately on leaving the court, Sarno was again arrested, and told that he was to be put on board a ship bound for Russia.

It was announced in the House of Lords that no invitation or request whatever had come from the Russian Government for England to take

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

this action. It was a purely spontaneous and gratuitous act on the part of the British Home Office. The home secretary stated it was quite false that he had ever ordered any man to go to Russia, and he said that there would be no deportations. Finally, Lord Sheffield, on July 27, 1916, made a well-reasoned speech to the House of Lords in which he defended the right of asylum, lashed the Government and the police, and etched the eminent Jewish home secretary, Mr. Herbert Samuel, in unforgettable terms. He said:

“If I were a Jew or had a drop of Jewish blood in my veins, I would sooner cut my hand off than say to one of these men, ‘If you do not enlist in the British army, you, being a Polish Jew, shall go back, not where you like, to any part of the world, but to Poland or to Russia.’ ”

Earl Russell stood side by side with Lord Sheffield in defying the Government policy, and once again, as on more occasions than one in British history, the lords saved the liberty of the individual men from the encroachments of the Government and the indifference of the Commons. The English people had no wish, of

SOCIAL STUDIES

course, for this tyranny. They had no knowledge of it. Graham Wallas has warned us against the modern conception of the "Psychology of the Crowd." He has warned us against seeing populations as individually thoughtful and temperate and collectively blind and ferocious. It is the fallacy of our generation to believe that whole peoples go insane in a wild swirl, and do this thing and wish that thing by imitation and suggestion and sympathy. Of course political movements are in fact carried out "by men conscious and thoughtful, though necessarily ill informed," and these movements seem to the slack observer, fed on our popular sociologists, "to be due to the blind and unconscious impulses of masses 'incapable both of reflection and reasoning.'" It is so with the right of asylum and the suppression of the Russians. The English people have not gone war-mad. They have not risen up to overthrow the principles of freedom and justice for which they have in the main long contended.

But under cover of the war, when the attention of millions of the inhabitants was strained on another matter, a little group of militarists, pol-

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

iticians, and policemen have tried to carry out a reactionary program. It is familiar to all students of the institution of police that it is the tendency of their practice at times of strain to "take away a man's character by administrative decree on secret police information." It is not that they fail to act honestly on the best of their "information and belief"; it is that the secret and one-sided examination, followed by peremptory action, is not a perfect method for establishing truth. "Spy," "crook," "anarchist," and "pervert" are words for them that do duty in place of public legal procedure.

The attempts to harass Russian refugees have been fewer and feebler since Lord Sheffield spoke. In November the British authorities removed four Russians from a Danish ship, but their case was tried in open court. And in a case tried on the same day, January 11 of this year, concerning a French political refugee, the lord chief-justice laid down the British law for all such cases, and restored the ancient tradition of the nation. He said:

"Parliament had not given the home secretary power to make an order which would forcibly

SOCIAL STUDIES

remove a man from this country to another country to which he did not wish to go."

English justice refused to be muzzled by conscription, munitions acts, military service acts, and the Defense of the Realm Act. So ended the second chapter of this record. Chapter one showed certain English authorities as stupid as the police of Chicago and New York during "anarchist" flurries. Chapter two revealed the English people as alert in the defense of freedom as in the days before the war. The right of asylum had been reaffirmed.

Then came chapter three, with the entrance of the new British Government. The new Government represents the triumph of the executive over the Parliamentary legislative division of authority. Mr. Bonar Law announced on February 27 to the House of Commons that Russians in England must enlist as British soldiers or be deported to Russia. On the same day at the Old-Street Police Court the Magistrate said to David Cohen, a Russian:

We do not want you here if you are not going to do your duty. If you succeed in proving that you are of

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

Russian nationality, I shall do my best to get you sent back.

On March 7, I attended a debate in the House of Lords, where Lord Sheffield pointed out that the home of an Englishwoman had been raided while she was held in prison with no charge made against her, and in her absence papers were confiscated. These papers were pamphlets in defense of the right of asylum. Lord Sheffield then cited the case of a Russian refugee in London who wished to return to the United States, where he had taken out his first naturalization papers. The letter of the Home Office was produced in evidence, and this letter refused the Russian's request.

The Secretary of State for War, the Earl of Derby, replied for the Government. He said that one of the seized pamphlets, entitled "The Right of Asylum," was of such a character as to make it unfit for circulation at this time. Very skilfully he created an "atmosphere" about that pamphlet, so that the listener felt that it was treasonable and seditious. But I possess a copy of that pamphlet, and it is not unfit for circula-

SOCIAL STUDIES

tion in a free country. It is an appeal by London Russians not to be sent back. It is simply that.

The "noble Earl" went on to refer to one of the societies of Russians as suspicious, and therefore a fair field for official investigation. He forgot that he was defending an official policy which would place those suspicious persons in the army.

The Lord Chancellor spoke next. Lord Finlay, the present Lord Chancellor, is always worth hearing, because he is naïve. It was he who, in a debate on admitting women as solicitors, said:

The question is: What is the proper sphere of women? I do not believe that the active practice of a profession is compatible with the proper work of women as mothers and in attending to their families. I regret that there are many women who do not have an opportunity of marriage in this country. Probably in time opportunities will be found for them in other parts of the Empire where they can become the mothers of mighty nations.

In the present debate on the right of Asylum, he was equally delightful when he said that the

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

Russian political refugees owed a duty to their nation, Russia.

Lord Sheffield was snowed under by these vigorous reactionaries, and the old man hobbled away on two canes. But for all that, he had made it clear that an ancient right was being removed by executive decree, instead of by constitutional methods. If the British people wish to abolish the right of asylum, they should be permitted to do so by Act of Parliament.

No nation, with all its young men in the field, will tolerate the presence of non-combatant aliens, filling the jobs vacated by the citizen army. The Mayor of Bethnal Green said recently.

Men have to sacrifice their little businesses or their small factories to serve at the front, and neighbors of foreign parentage step into their places and reap the reward.

Two other mayors of East London, representatives of the borough councils, local tribunals, and of the London County Council, supported his statement and passed a resolution calling on Parliament to remedy the evil. The alien must be willing to defend the nation in which he makes

SOCIAL STUDIES

his residence or else leave for some other land not under war-pressure. But he should receive the right to select his destination. To force him to return to a country which would imprison him, is as unjust as it is for him to claim protection in a country which he is unwilling to defend.

PUBLIC OPINION

England would have been one more quiet, comfortable power of the second rank but for its northern and western counties. Its recent history would have been the history of Holland if it had not been for the storehouse of coal and iron in the industrial provinces. It was out of them, and out of the people bred there, that she has derived her vast strength in meeting the new world created by the industrial revolution that came in one century ago on the invention of machinery. Those northern and western parts of Great Britain have won the fight of democracy, and established the principle of democratic control. What we used to mean by England was southern England. It was Oxford, Cambridge, and London. The genius and the vitality of the kingdom were gathered there, and the

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

radiations went out from those centers to make the impress of what the world knew as English influence.

Imperceptibly the change has come. The governing class has ceased to govern. The type of Englishman who was born to rule is left without a job. Power and virtue have departed from the old order. The Oxford and Cambridge hierarchy exist in a vacuum. Patriarchal England, reared in the humanities, impervious to modern ideas, indifferent to alien points of view, unconsciously arrogant, heavily stupid, kindly, cultivated, and honorable, was unfitted to the modern world of quick thinking, swift action, sympathetic coöperation. It is dying in our sight. In the first weeks of war the shell of that little England collapsed; the organism itself had long since weakened. In its place has arisen a far more formidable, far more democratic state, the British commonwealth.

As fast as power shifts a psychological change takes place. The English nature and character are visibly altering. A swifter order of men are in control. The men of power show Celtic characteristics. Under the touch of the new influ-

SOCIAL STUDIES

ence, which is industrial and democratic, there is a brightening and quickening. The old inarticulateness passes. The race grows talkative. It responds to excitement.

Public opinion, as it reverberates in London, is no longer the public opinion of Great Britain. It is not the public opinion of the Cornwall miners, of the South Wales miners, of the industrial centers of Liverpool, Birmingham, Manchester, and Glasgow. It is not the public opinion of Montreal, and Sydney. London and the south of England do not speak for the commonwealth. “The Manchester Guardian” understands the sentiment of Glasgow and Montreal, but the London “Morning Post” does not.

When Lloyd-George struck out his brilliant suggestion for Ireland—a suggestion which will bring the solution of a question seven hundred years old—he spoke the requiem of the England known to us in memoirs, novels, and letters; the England of our college literary course, of the historic tradition, the caste system, the landed gentry, the noble lady, the faithful servitor, the hackney coachman, the genial vicar, and the Oxford

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

don. He proposed that the matter of Ireland be handed over to the imperial conference, the congress of the five democracies. England's time had gone. She could n't solve the ancient wrong, but the new commonwealth could solve it. Take it away from the tired kingdom, and give it to the young democracy. Government is no longer an affair of historic tradition. It is a very troublesome matter of digging out the facts, and applying them to brand-new and rapidly changing conditions. It requires qualities of swift decision and execution. Industrial working-class England takes over the Government, assumes control of life, and side by side with radical Scotland and Wales and Australia and Canada creates the new state. With the passing of Little England, the "literary" Englishman whom we have known passes, the courtly and simple nobleman, the charming litterateur, the "scholar and gentleman," and there comes in his stead a democratic person, open to ideas, willing to learn, and very willing to work out in partnership the problems of democratic control.

There are clever men who are attempting to capture this newer England and to manipulate

SOCIAL STUDIES

its public opinion. They discern certain of the creative elements in the change, organization, efficiency, business methods, government by experts. Two such men are Horatio Bottomley and Lord Northcliffe. Through "John Bull," "The Times," "The Daily Mail," and other publications they wield a wide influence. Bottomley and Northcliffe are of the familiar type of American company promoter. They are a mixture of the politician and the financier. They have a tough masculine geniality, a shrewd common sense, and what is called "an understanding of human nature," which means a knack of playing on the coarser impulses and motives of the democracy. Essentially they are bad leaders, because they don't believe in the best qualities of the masses of men whom they are leading. They see that average human nature is easily flattered, is loaded to the gunwale with prejudices, and that it can be manipulated by phrases promising action. Excitement, change, the sense of "something doing," are pleasurable to the average man. A newspaper program which "makes and unmakes" ministers, creates heroes and villains, wrecks and reconstructs, gives a continuous performance of

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

moving pictures to its readers. In the flicker of the film ideas and true political policy lose their sovereignty. By making use of the new forces of democracy, such men as the modern popular journalists may have it in their power a little to misdirect them. This failure of sane public opinion to register itself is almost inevitable in a society where the millionaire proprietor is able to conduct a chain of newspapers which reflect his own mind, and which misrepresent his readers in certain matters by giving them what they want in the general news of the world, in pictures, and admirable special articles, and in hammering through a program of reconstruction, much of which is sound and responsive to the needs of the community.

I am trying to untangle what seems to me the silent and real opinion of the nation from the voices that fill the air. Any one would be singularly inept who pretended to interpret with any finality the public opinion of a people. What I give is merely the product of contacts with a few thousand British. The experience is all necessarily incomplete and superficial. This is offered merely as what I have seen and heard.

SOCIAL STUDIES

It is a collection of little fragments of public opinion.

The stuff talked in certain London centers is misleading and mischievous and sometimes wilfully malicious. It is the bitter cry of persons who have lost their influence. There are little groups of elderly men and women in London who inflame themselves with hate of the German people. They speak of them as a nation of beasts, outside the human race. This is very unrepresentative of English public opinion, which has made the clear distinction in its mind between the doped, duped German people and the band of predatory assassins who are in control of them.

Again, on Ireland, I can quote an English officer, whom I heard say on his return from Dublin:

“Remove the Nationalist politicians from Westminster. Suppress the Irish newspapers. Then give them conscription. They will yield.”

He and “The Morning Post” represent that minute fraction of “die hards” who feel the tide floating them down the beach and try to dig their heels into the sand. The will of the British

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

people is for a settlement of the Irish question. There is no hatred of Ireland among the masses of the community. The desire of the average Englishman is to be let alone and to let other people alone.

It is always necessary to find out whether a statement of opinion represents the mass consciousness or whether it is spoken from personal bitterness and class interest. I can quote Leo Maxse, who writes in his "National Review," "There is nothing in common between the standpoint of the civilized part of Europe and the United States." But I am quoting a shrill and lonely voice. The mass of people in England are as unaware of America as the middle West is unaware of England. They are not scornful or antagonistic. They are indifferent with the large indifference of ignorance. In the part of the English community who are aware of the United States as the "big show," to quote a Broad Street cotton broker, there is little resentment and much good-will. The "Tommy," the farmer, the shop-keeper, when he meets the individual American, has the tolerance of his kind for all alien folk that come from some other country than his own.

SOCIAL STUDIES

They all seem a little strange to him, but they are "all right." He includes the American with the Australian and the Welshman.

Public opinion, then, is not really concerned at all with exterminating German clerks, oppressing Irish peasants, annoying American business men. It is not "out" to govern the world or rule "backward races."

What are its concerns?

Its main concern at the moment is to go through with a bad job to the end, to win a victory in order to have a lasting peace. Englishmen hate war, and they were first astonished, then irritated, and finally angry that any nation should let loose a hideous slaughter into a fairly peaceable world. They were slow to believe German methods of frightfulness. In the early months I could get a hearing, but little credence, for the atrocities I had witnessed. A good-natured skepticism was the response. But once thoroughly in a nasty business, they are now determined to see it through. They will hang on. It is hard for them to pry loose when they have taken hold. When their clutch has automatically clicked and got set, there seems to be no device in the machin-

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

ery for setting itself free. And that offers the chance for the imperialists, with their “spheres of influence” and territorial claims, to turn what was idealistic in the early purposes of the young men to their own advantage. “Why should n’t England take a bit in return for the sacrifice?” One hears this idea occasionally expressed. This is not the will of England. The vast majority went into the war in a spirit of devotion, and they wish to come out of it as clean-handed and clean-minded as they entered.

There is a powerful peace movement, not representing anything approaching a majority. It is, in fact, a small fraction of the community; but I call it powerful because it worries the authorities, and because it is growing, though very slowly. The impression which Mr. Trevelyan has given to America of a wide-spread desire for an immediate peace—a desire muzzled from expression by the authorities—is false; but there is an increasing receptivity to the idea of peace.

The next concern of public opinion is with the internal situation. The mind of the man belonging to the upper possessing class has become accustomed to change. For a generation he has

SOCIAL STUDIES

felt the foundation growing unsteady. The institutions which seemed to him immutable are visibly modifying—the institutions of property, church, and marriage. He is not in favor of the ever-spreading change, but he has mentally accepted the fact that change is taking place. The old authority has passed to other hands, and he is bewildered by the juggle which has transformed upper-class rule into democratic control. Nothing in itself now surprises him, because the whole process is amazing. Without a protest he has seen state socialism installed at Westminster and feminism at the War Office. Patiently he awaits what will happen next and what will come of it all. What has been undermined is “a certain organic conception of society—the conception of the hierarchy of authorities which dominated the Middle Ages. The old order has been destroyed by the new ideals of justice and liberty, beginning with religion, passing on to politics,” modifying industry, “and reaching at last the private relations of marriage and the family.” These new ideals have penetrated the thought of the community, and have gradually sought fulfilment in the lagging, painful proc-

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

esses of legislation. The older type of politician was unable to frame such revolutionary concepts into acts, so what has happened is the creation of a new order of civil servants. "What is growing, rapidly, and yet almost unobserved by the public, is expert legislation by permanent officials."

It is small wonder that the elderly, kindly gentleman whom we have taken as representative of his class is dazed by the shifting world of flux where once he stood firmly. He is on a moving-sidewalk, and he is quite sure he is under way, though he himself is not walking. But not only is that gentle conservative puzzled by the advance; the general public have not intellectually realized the change which their own impulse toward freedom has created. Public opinion to-day is constantly in the attitude of a man who has his desires answered before he has stated them. The democratic state is moving faster than the individual citizen, and he is mentally confused. The moving finger writes, and public opinion will have to find its place in the appendix to the Book of Acts, recording the establishment of democratic control during the Great War.

SOCIAL STUDIES

WHERE THE LANE TURNS

A letter has come to me from a friend. He is a charming writer, fellow of a Cambridge college. He objects to my summary dismissal of the older England as recorded in the preceding chapter. He says:

"If ever there was a typical Oxford man, with an Oxford cast of thought in the direct Oxford tradition, it is H. A. L. Fisher, the new minister of education. The new ministry of labor, being forced to get a permanent head capable of dealing with the problems they are up against, does not get a trade-union leader, but an Eton-Balliol scholar and fellow of All Souls. I am afraid, as a narrow-minded pedant, I am convinced that brains are what always tell in the long run, and I don't think commerce or "life" or the newer universities are yet the equal of the old universities in producing and training brain. Moreover, Oxford and Cambridge are not "south of England," as you suggest. Their geographical position has nothing to do with their nature. They are the oldest and most independent republics in England and totally ex-territorial, like the city of Washington."

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

Of course he is exactly right, and I believe we are both right. Now is the meeting of the old and new, and even a profound modification of structure will include vestigial traces. Every summary statement concerning so complex a thing as the modern community must wait for verification on psychological records which have not yet been made. "Crowd psychology" is still in the hands of hasty generalizers and pseudo-scientists, who write of the "herd instinct." So it is with this book. It is a personal impression, and it paints in broad colors. A. E. Zimmern of the reconstruction committee, H. N. Spalding of the welfare department of the ministry of munitions, and Dr. Fisher, the minister of education, have all cautioned me against over-emphasizing the speed of change in so stable a community as the British nation and against making too logical and intellectualistic an analysis of British character. The Briton is a sociable, humorsome fellow who moves slowly and is not logical in his ways, but proceeds along the lines of his own individualistic psychology in contact with his own peculiar and ancient environment.

But a reconstruction is under way. A peace-

SOCIAL STUDIES

able, slow-moving race has been swept by the winds of doctrine and the forces of change. Great questions are suddenly opened that were regarded as settled or non-existent, or buried in the silence of respectability. Let me show the method of that change in the concrete instance of education. Two systems of education exist to-day in England side by side. There is the long-established system of private education for the upper class by the great schools of Eton, Harrow, Rugby, Westminster, and the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. There is public education by local boards and new universities. The two systems are unrelated, and so, from the point of view of a national system of education, they are anomalous.

But because there is this anomaly, it does not follow that the reconstruction will "hack its way through." The process will be a filtration, and not a surgical operation. Slowly the great universities will be modernized, and steadily the new institutions will be urged to aim at the level of culture which the humanities gave. A "bread-and-butter" education alone will never be the one aim of English instruction. The arts alone

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

will never again be in sole command of the field. But a new program will be wrought out of both sets of values.

From a certain public school twenty-seven out of twenty-eight scholarships to the university were taken in the humanities. It is improbable that twenty-seven out of twenty-eight represents the actual proportion in aptitude of that group for a literary culture as contrasted with a scientific culture. The probable proportion would be more like fourteen for the humanities, and fourteen for the science. To redress that balance will be the task of the coming reconstruction, and it will be achieved without upsetting the English temperament and tradition.

One elementary school differs from another as widely as an elementary school differs from Harrow. To level up elementary schools to standard without invading local autonomy is another difficult task of the reconstruction. A few years ago education was decentralized, and the local boards, by refusing government grants, can separate their local institution from the national system. Not by offending these local boards can the betterment come. The Government, by its financial

SOCIAL STUDIES

grants and by wise suggestion, can, however, influence the local boards to modern methods. Little by little modern educators will sit on those boards, and two men of forward-looking mind can swing a session of "stand-patters." It may be, at some point in the future, that full control of education will pass back to a central authority, and that what is now advisory will become mandatory. But the public are far from ready to accept such a change, and the local boards will continue to be the machinery through which the minister of education will operate.

The period of adolescence of the working-class population will be gradually dealt with. Between fourteen and eighteen years of age there is a vast waste of vocational and cultural potentiality in the child. That waste is clearly recognized. The youngster as yet goes out from board school into blind-alley jobs, which leave him as unskilled and ignorant as an adult. Continuation schools, a system of part-time work and part-time instruction, a raising of the school age, more pay, and better teachers—these and a dozen other details will all be handled by the method I have outlined, which is never slashing and drastic

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

reform by an autocratic state. It is largely the extension of an ancient practice to a wider group. It is partly the response of a flexible system to new knowledge. It is a gradual method, "brick on brick," as is the English way. But when the builders have completed their task, the structure will be new in the eyes of the community, and the institution housed there will be as little like the "Eton-Balliol" institution as King George V's commonwealth is like King George IV's England.

The old system of education produced a governing class, a group of men of integrity and trained intelligence. They legislated, colonized, hunted, and followed the life of culture with distinction, and they continued to make England the greatest of the nations. As long as the old formulæ and the old ethics were sufficient, the inheritors of that tradition were the inevitable masters of government. But suddenly the two aspects of government made an astonishing turn. Control of the environment entered on a new development with the coming of steam-power and machinery. The peasant and yeoman community passed out of existence. The land went

SOCIAL STUDIES

back to grass. Industrial cities and massed populations came in. And that new control of the environment altered the other aspect of government—the relationship of man to man. Industrial organization created new alinements of party, interest, and class. The governing class began to flutter in a world not realized, like the thin-voiced shades about Ulysses. But the mass of the people, to whom the power passed, have not yet found their leaders.

Two civilizations are coexistent here. One is a very ancient and noble civilization. The other is new and chaotic, caught in the process of becoming. The ancient civilization was sure of itself, possessing a tradition and code of action. The new is too busy to develop a technic of life or manner. It does n't know where it is going, but it is on the way. The effect is that of electric lighting in Warwick Castle or a trolley-car to Stonehenge. Everywhere in Great Britain one feels the modern thrusting through the rich soil and surface cake of what is older than the life of man. "The Popular Magazine" and "The Top Notch" are widely read in Ireland. In the little Hampshire village of Emsworth bright, new

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

jerry-built bungalows rise close to the huddle of centuries-old fishermen's cottages, and motor-cars flash past thatched roofs under the great spire of Chichester and come to rest in a renovated moss-grown inn. Peasants touch their hats as you pass and call you "sir," and the girl conductor of the omnibus is sometimes as curt and scornful as a Chicago expressman. In the Devon hamlet of Lewdown the farm women with whom we lived continue to make clotted cream as their likes made it when *John Ridd* climbed to his courting, but eagerly borrow my London paper every evening after the chores are done. The church is still firmly established, but the congregation waits for the afternoon service, and the afternoon service is held in the cinema house. The king is a very gallant and modest gentleman, but he does not possess the power of Arthur Henderson or the influence of H. W. Massingham. Still stands the House of Lords, but the lords of power are Devonport, Rhondda, and Northcliffe, business lords. The telephone and tram-car stretch their wires through lanes where the cavaliers rode, and there is an excellent telegraph service in the village in which Baring

SOCIAL STUDIES

Gould is writing the legends of his country-side.

The new-comers are not taking the Kingdom by violence. They do not tear down the old. No, they take the heart out of it, and let it wither like a plant stung by the frost. The wreckers will never march through England armed with condemnation writs and blasting-powder. But gradually the light railways spread their threads, while "The Daily Mail" scatters its modernism to millions. It is possible by careful selection to convince oneself that the former things have not passed away. It is true that they linger, but new forces are in command, and England of the poets is an old-age pensioner in the house of her daughters of the British commonwealth. They make war in vain who fight against these things. Raw energy is in the saddle, and the galled jade must gallop to new spurs.

THE NEW WAY

Liberalism has ceased to be a political theory and has become a program of reconstruction, planning reform by intensive intellectual effort. After the Napoleonic wars a period of deadness

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

set in, and gradually middle-class liberalism, barren of ideas, assumed control. It did not come to grips with its world, because it did not have the proper method. But in recent years the way to study human society has been discovered. A group of university men began to put their thought on the organization of human life. The working-class party sprang up. There has never existed so wide a division between the intellectuals and the workers in England as in America. The English workers have never swallowed whole the Marxian analysis. They have preferred step by step reform to the spreading of a theory.

As the result of much patient piece-meal work, based on "the accumulation and analysis of economic knowledge," a whole new body of legislation was incorporated into English life, beginning with the year 1906. That process continues. The principles of this reconstruction are derived from the conception that a community must work hard with its mind in order to organize a good society. Untrammeled by dogma, the practical English intelligence, both of the working-class brain and of the intellectuals, has set about reshaping its institutions of property and state.

SOCIAL STUDIES

The Fabian Society and "The Round Table" group have aided in the work of collecting facts and sharpening the analysis. There have been brilliant scouts like Wells and Shaw. But back of them, and providing them with the equipment for their sorties, are the hard workers with a genius for taking pains, like the Webbs, Seebohm Rowntree, and Bruno Lasker. "The development of more delicate logical methods and the accumulation of recorded observations are now making deliberate thought about mankind less inexact and misleading than at any other point in history."

Lately, many persons have been thinking with the lash on them. How to stop the Zeppelins, make shells, and overcome the damage of war—these questions are being dealt with at high speed. The community is becoming aware of itself; it is devising an imperial economy, which correlates industry to national needs and includes the family budget in its process of thought. The easy generalizations of political exiles and closet-philosophers have been displaced by fact-investigations and analysis from the records. *Laissez-faire*, the economic man, economic determinism,

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

and the other substitutes for hard work, no longer content the community which wishes to find itself. Patiently and gropingly, a synthesis for the new society is being formed.

Almost unobserved, a literature is forming around the social movement. It is a literature where the pressure of thought has been so intense and controlled that it has wrought for itself a special style. I feel sure that if Professor Saintsbury were to extend his anthology of "English Prose Rythms," he would include paragraphs from Bertrand Russell, A. E., Edward Carpenter, Lowes Dickinson, Havelock Ellis, and Graham Wallas. They carry a tone and accent, giving pleasure to the inward ear. These men write a clear and precise English, which travels easily and without fatigue, and often rises to beauty on its own momentum of thought. They seem to have lifted the technic of style to a new level; perhaps no higher than that of several earlier periods, but different. They have introduced a fresh cadence into the prose music of the last four centuries. There is an absence of premeditated eloquence, of overstatement, of the wind of words. There has come a realization that the limit of lan-

SOCIAL STUDIES

guage in one direction had been reached with “multitudinous seas” and “purple riot,” and that the prose writers who pushed along that track of the poets reached a point of strain in De Quincey and Landor beyond which laughter lurked. The inevitable reaction gave us the clear, cold dreariness of Herbert Spencer and the suppression and aridity of Arnold.

But these modern prose writers, interpreting the new social order, have taken a fresh trail. And I do not doubt they have abolished the purple patch as effectually as they have avoided the anemia of thwarted impulse. Their meaning is more exactly expressed than in the pages of men who used loosely and cheaply “God,” “nature,” “happiness,” and “society.” But the pains of a scientific precision have not silenced the music. There is none of the jumbled terminology of our troubled “sociologists” and psychologists. These men have lifted their scholarship into simplicity. It is perhaps only an interesting chance that two of them are mathematicians, but it is profoundly significant that all of them are students of human society, not in the old literary way of projecting Utopias, but

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

through the process of hard thinking on the facts of life.

"In the end it is the psychological question of fact which will have to settle the ethical question of conduct."

It is no longer enough for us that a passage in a book shall be "well written," as the famous and unintelligent pages of Lecky on prostitution. Writing that concerns itself with society, if it is to win a response from us, must be grounded on observation of the facts. It must bring a scientific method to bear on "the vast and constantly growing accumulation of recorded observations." Surely in these choice writers of the reconstruction we have that quality which the democracy, if it is wise, will cherish. We have that natural aristocracy, that sovereignty of the best, which alone is able to set a standard for the mass-people.

THE NEW AMERICANISM

Around 20,000,000 happy firesides the fathers of America will gather this night with their unbroken family circle, with their children upon their knees and their wives by their side, happy and prosperous. Contrast this with the fathers, husbands and brothers of

SOCIAL STUDIES

the Old World, dying in the ditches. . . . Who is it that would have our President exchange with the blood-bespattered monarchs of the Old World? . . . He is the world teacher, his class is made up of kings, kaisers, czars, princes, and potentates.—*Senator Ollie James, Permanent Chairman of the Democratic National Convention.*

With the causes and the objects of this war we are not concerned.—*Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States.*

The superb assurance of Captain Hans Rose, coupled with his inimitable ability, shown when he brought the *U-53* into Newport, Rhode Island, paid and received visits of courtesy, handed to an American newspaper man a letter for Ambassador von Bernstorff, dived and was away on a mission of destruction within three hours, carries with it a wholesome savor of knightly conduct that goes home to the moral center of every American.—“*The Evening Gazette,*” Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

I write this article as the result of conversations and correspondence with a wide group of Americans and English and French, made up of politicians, economists, historians, psychologists, and literary men. I find in thoughtful men to-day both in America and Europe a challenge of certain tendencies in our national thought. I

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

believe that challenge to be well grounded. A great mass of talk and letters suddenly came to focus one day in what one man, a distinguished scholar, expressed to me. So in what follows I have taken the lines and phrases of his thought. But what he stated is only the clear expression of what many are saying and feeling.

We have failed to teach our true American tradition to new-comers, but certain of our newspapers and of our popular voices have been busy in creating a legend of Americanism which contains an element of falsity. We have displayed a self-complacency in our proclamation of freedom, a readiness to assume that it was our monopoly, and that no other nation understood so fully what it meant or had done such service for it. This has led to a lack of sympathy with other nations that have achieved freedom or are aspiring after it or are helping to strengthen and extend it. This attitude has been reflected in our school histories. The establishment of American independence is represented in these school-books, in newspaper writing, in popular speeches, as a protest against tyranny, a breaking-away from Old-World chains. But this is not how

SOCIAL STUDIES

scientific historians of the modern school see that event. Despite her grave mistakes then, England had endowed our States, as she has endowed every settlement of European stock which she has planted, with the institutions of self-government, from which sprang our desire for a wider freedom. Despite the many mistakes she has made since, she has carried freedom and justice to new populations, and has been an unwearied breeder of free nations. Our popular conception of our Revolution, our self-complacency in our proclamation of freedom as an American monopoly, have kept us out of an organic relation with the whole world of civilization. We have failed in recent years to feel that this world is one, and the cause of freedom a single cause, to whose fortunes no free society can be indifferent or neutral. That breach is a tragedy, perhaps one of the greatest tragedies in history. It has been a bad thing for civilization, because it has weakened the defense of freedom by alienating its strongest advocates from one another, and persuading one of them to stand aloof from its struggles. It has been a bad thing for America, by leading her to imagine that she is not as other

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

nations are, and that the working out of the great issues of civilization in Europe had no interest for her.

This falsity in the popular view of the European situation has cut us off from sympathy with other peoples who have loved freedom not less sincerely. We have continually misunderstood England, the tyrant state which America had defied. We have had the curious spectacle of a friendship between the two nations that was almost wholly one-sided. England has repeatedly helped and supported us; we have not really believed that England stood, in the main, for freedom and justice. And what is true of our attitude toward England is true in varying degree of our attitude toward the other "old strugglers" of Europe. We have not believed it was our duty to give support to Belgium, to the French, or to the Italians in the struggle for the enlargement of liberty.

When the autocrats of the Holy Alliance were, as Canning put it, "aspiring to bind Europe in chains," they crushed the movement toward freedom in Italy and Spain, and then purposed to crush it also in Spanish America. Canning, in

SOCIAL STUDIES

the name of Great Britain, defied them, recognized the independence of the Spanish colonies, and made it plain that the British fleet would resist any attempt to send armies to South America. He approached our Government with the suggestion that the United States should take their stand by the side of Great Britain. President Monroe's message was the result. That was the promise that America was going to make freedom her concern even outside of her own bounds. It was not a proclamation of suzerainty over the double continent. Monroe's message and the fear of the British fleet kept European armies out of South America. It is the British fleet which has in recent years saved the Monroe Doctrine from challenge. But our popular conception has turned the Monroe Doctrine into an assertion of American self-containedness and indifference to Europe.

Again, in the Spanish-American War we made the cause of freedom outside our bounds our own cause. But having done this, we came to regard it as only an American question. There was nothing which the Spaniards did in Cuba comparable with what the Germans have done in Bel-

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

gium. The sinking of the *Maine* was no less capable of explanation and excuse than the sinking of the *Lusitania*. There was no tie of obligation to Cuba more primal than our national signature to The Hague conventions. The Belgian outrages were as much our concern as the Cuban outrages.

Loyalty to an ideal becomes vulgarized and tarnished when it is interpreted in a self-regarding way. It is not freedom that our people have been recently worshiping, but only the brand of it called American freedom, which we have persuaded ourselves is something peculiar and different in kind from other brands. By our newspaper and popular conception of Americanism we have not taught our new-comers the American tradition of Franklin, Monroe, Lincoln, and John Hay. We have taught them to despise other lands, to regard all the peoples of the Old World as alike reactionary and illiberal. We have failed to impart an understanding of the labors for the expansion of liberty which have been undertaken by other peoples. Many of our people have come to believe that since American freedom is something peculiar or esoteric, it has few or no

SOCIAL STUDIES

responsibilities in the larger world, and may rightly become self-regarding. In the present war it appears as little more than the opportunity of enlarging material prosperity. The obligation of sacrifice, the maintenance of other than our own rights, seem the wild words of idealists like Putnam and Morton Prince, and the quixotic acts of college boys like the members of the Norton Ambulance. An ideal of freedom that is restricted and purely self-regarding, however eloquent the phrases that clothe it, is an uninspiring ideal. It is not astonishing that many of our citizens, under the influence of this ideal, have concentrated their attention on making money from the agonies of Europe. It is not astonishing that some elements among them have found greater inspiration in the exacting demands of the ideals of other nations. Even the German ideal demands heroic sacrifice. A belief in liberty so self-regarding as ours cozens itself that liberty is served even by accepting the *Lusitania* crime, passing lightly over the Belgian, Lorraine, and Armenian horrors, and submitting to the outrages of ***U-53***.

Our recent immigrants are led to believe that

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

in coming to America they are coming to the only real home of liberty, that they have no responsibility for the championing of justice elsewhere, and that they have no concern with the dog-fights of the "effete monarchies" and enemies of liberty left in Europe. Some of these new-comers are ready to adopt that view because they come from lands where tyranny is still in command. Justice and freedom are not made to appear to them one supreme cause wherever they are on trial, worthy of sacrifice; but they appear as achievements of our own, peculiar to us, rewarded with material advantages. With them our historic tradition is not an inheritance. With many of them it is not even an acquisition. The terms of the life which created our tradition were not terms of ease and aloofness. The life was a struggle with pioneer primitive conditions, against forces of nature, hostile bands of Indians, foreign troops, and traitorous men among us. But our recent immigrants have come to us to escape from severe conditions, and their cry is, in the words of Mary Antin, "What has America given us?" Corruption in politics and business,

SOCIAL STUDIES

cosmopolitanism in feeling, luxury, waste, commercialism—all these are increasingly the products of the recent years. Instead of being the struggling arena for a great experiment in democracy, we are becoming the grab-bag for all that is predatory in human nature. With the change in blood has come a change in national character. We are shaking off the old beliefs, the tradition of sacrifice and discipline and responsibility.

In a smaller matter than the present World War we could comfort ourselves with the failures of other nations. We have high precedent for our abstention from crisis. But this is a moment when France and England are well served by their tradition of freedom and justice, and when our modern Americanism lends itself to an easy distortion. It is a moment when one is proud to be a Frenchman or an Englishman, and when we, for all our prosperity, do not feel very proud to be American. There have been moments in the past when the prides would have been reversed; but this is not one of them, and this is the greatest moment of history.

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

NATIONALITY

In a Frenchman nationality can be set afame by a touch. He has consciously thought about it. This is because he and his fellows as a nation have been invaded again and again, and as a nation have marched out across Europe. Almost every half-century France has gone forward to the frontier, following or facing some imperialist, to bleed its life away. So a Frenchman kindles at thought of his nation, and that thought is a love for the soil of his *patrie*, for the house where he was born, and for the sunlight and the equality of his beautiful country.

The nationality of a German is a touchy affair. It was only a few years ago that his country was a handful of petty states. Now suddenly a big, powerful, deific engine, the state, has somehow gathered him in with the weak kingdoms, and he is half afraid that the concern will slip away in the night, and leave him again with his dreams and his music, and his empire broken back into small bits. He is still in the pain of a swift process.

SOCIAL STUDIES

The myth of nationality is a profound and necessary truth, as well-grounded as any that governs human nature. It is blind and brutal and righteous. It moves to aggression, or lives peacefully at home. It builds big guns or is pastoral. It is merely the collective expression of human nature in the particular group which circumstance and natural liking have created. It was formed as much by chance as the family—accident, propinquity, commercial considerations. Once formed, it is as natural as the family. Tagore says that “a new age is imminent, when the ideal of nationalism will be discarded.”

But a greater than Tagore has said:

What muddles the moderns about the institution of the family is what muddles them also about Nationalism: it is this double aspect of unity and multiplicity. The principle of one house, one vote, seems to them a crumbling dream. So some of them cannot believe in the corporate mystery of patriotism, though it sets the world on fire before their very eyes. They ask what a nation is; and can only be shown dissolving views and visions. They see a mob tossing in a market-place; and then a king sitting alone upon a throne of marble; and then only innumerable interiors, like cells of a bee-hive, with each man eating his own breakfast

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

and minding his own business; and then, again, only smoke and sky, and a painted rag upon a pole that drives out upon the driving wind. And all these are one thing.

That nationality does, as a matter of fact, penetrate to deeper sources of instinctive life than other forms of association, such as religion and socialism, is proved by the alinements of the present war, where comrade fights comrade, and Catholic fights Catholic. Zimmern gives the reason:

Why should our citizenship take precedence of our trade unionism or our business obligations? Aristotle replies, and in spite of recent critics I think the reply still holds good: because, but for the existence of the State and the reign of law maintained by it, none of these associations could have been formed or be maintained.

Nationality lies very deeply buried in the subconsciousness of an Englishman. It required a world war to dig it out. Empire talk never existed with the English till it came to the surface with Burke, and received from him a certain shaping and impetus. It dozed again till Dis-

SOCIAL STUDIES

raeli gave it a shove, and it sped along rather briskly in the latter days of Victoria and her Second Jubilee. But it never took strong hold of the general imagination, and there have been few jingo hysterias breaking about the idea of empire. There is of course an inner group of men, highly aware of empire as an affair of the state, and a much wider group of upper-class families whose sons find their career in being governors, magistrates, and minor officials. The Anglo-Indian, for instance, is a rather well-defined type. The young men have to go somewhere. They can't go into trade. They are well educated, men of honor, and, often enough, with a touch of vitality and adventure. Accordingly many of them trek off to the ends of the earth and enter public service in a crown colony. Such men were Cromer, Milner, and Curzon.

A few of them go farther yet, and push the imperial map into the jungle, or plant the flag in a floe. Selous was a true Englishman of this sort. So was Scott. The same breed of men are the sailors, and they have kept his Majesty's navy up to specifications for three hundred years. That is nationality for them, streaking

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

out over polar ice, splashing through swamps, and rolling through the seven seas.

But these men are a tiny fraction of the community,—“men of Biddeford in Devon,”—and their idea of England as a good place to see once a year or once in three years is n’t the nationality of the mass. The nationality of the mass of people lies deep, and in quiet days they hardly know they have it. There is a lot of silent pride in the navy and sea-power, and the “Britannia rule the waves” line probably comes as near to saying something as a popular song usually does. But of a dramatization of the “Island-Queen” there is none in the popular mind. The unconscious pride is enormous. You feel it in the abject loneliness of an Englishman off British soil. I have had very intimate English friends in New York, and there was always a kind of “lost” quality about their personality. They were loyal to the place that gave them bread, but they waited for the return with a long and touching patience. It was my fortune to see them returned, and catch the sigh of relief which the first years of the home-coming called out. Every simple little thing seemed good to these men, and

SOCIAL STUDIES

they would point out to me the wide commons of Wimbledon and the small, friendly locomotives of the suburban railway. An Englishman has to suffer before he knows he has a country.

It is suffering which the war has brought, the sense that something precious and intimate is imperiled. The Englishman likes the customs of his country and his own way of carrying on. Very slowly he learned that something was going to intrude and destroy that private wilfulness, that right of the individual man not only to his life, which is a little thing, but to his own peculiar way of living it, which is an important thing. His sense of possession of individual liberty is stronger than his property sense. Gradually the impression came upon him that there was a hub-bub across the channel, and that the noise was growing louder, that if he did n't do something there would be no end to it. His peace and quiet would be gone, and he would have to live by some one else's rules. As a young Englishwoman said to me: "We don't want strangers to step in and impose on us their manner of life. We don't want to be speeded up."

But still we have failed to reach the basis of

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

the instinctive nationality in an Englishman. I think it lies in the feelings grouped around his locality and his set of friends, the values that are closely familiar. One hears a man from Bernardsville, New Jersey, boast about Niagara Falls and the Rocky Mountains as if they were landscape features of his back yard; but an Englishman, if he talks at all, will speak of the fields he has hunted across, and the pleasant turn of the hills that are in sight from his windows.

I was glad to get it on good authority that I was right about this local patriotism. Captain Basil Williams has made a careful study of the organization of the British army. It is the function of his department to do so. He told me the nature of the appeal by which the millions of men were recruited. It was n't a vague, noisy crusade of advertising posters and general patriotism. It was directly aimed at where the men lived and their feeling of comradeship. The regiments were recruited by counties. (A few regiments came from more than one county.) The unit of recruiting is the battalion of one thousand men. In the original standing army, and in the new armies, the basis of the system is the regi-

SOCIAL STUDIES

mental local idea. Devonshire means something to a Lewdown man that Columbia County, New York, does not mean to a Hudson man. The Devon man and his people have shot rabbits and ruled the sea from that village in that county for several centuries.

When the war began and large numbers of recruits poured in, the old regimental system was maintained, and every new battalion was affiliated to some old regiment. The first new units were the special reserves, a battalion or two for each regiment, corresponding to the old militia. Then there came battalions of territorials, corresponding to the old volunteers. These territorials would be chosen from the smaller country districts. Then followed the service battalions.

It was difficult at first to obtain equipment and housing. So municipalities organized battalions in their own locality, and handed them over when the army was ready for them. Men said they would like to go with their neighbors and pals. Clerks, sportsmen, foot-ball players, men with the same interest in life, chummed together. War was a strange, new job, leaving the individual man lonely, and he wished to face

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

it with friends. These "pal" battalions were still attached to the original regiment.

In both the service and pals battalions Kitchener wished reserves. So each battalion added to its one thousand men five hundred more men, making a reserve battalion. Thus there resulted a reserve battalion of service battalions, and a reserve battalion of pals battalions.

There is no unit of numbers for a regiment, which can have two thousand men or twenty thousand. One regiment has twenty-six battalions, but the expanding numbers are glued together by the comradeship of long association in the pursuits of peace and by the sense of locality.

The first two armies, K1 and K2, were new service battalions from every regiment of the British army. The old army was thus duplicated by the first two new armies. The third new army, K3, was raised where recruiting was best, largely in the northern and western portions. K4 and K5 were made up of pals battalions. Of course all the other arms of service, medical staff, engineers, artillery, were raised locally, and were represented in these units. And this appeal to local patriotism has been the

SOCIAL STUDIES

method of increasing an army of five hundred thousand to five million.

Every regiment has ancient rights and privileges and points of local pride. The Honourable Artillery Company has the right to march through London with fixed bayonets, and the men exercise the right. At the entrance of the city they halt, unbuckle the bayonet, and thrust it into place. This ancestral quality to an army unit gives an *esprit de corps* that the men inherit, and a tradition which touches them to quickened service. It is a survival of the old linked battalion system, which provided that there should be two regular battalions, one normally abroad, and one in England. Overseas service and peace had combined to create the system. It gave an expeditionary force to guard India and South Africa. The old feeling was entirely regimental. Lately there has been an extension of the scale of feeling corresponding to the vast area of the war itself, and the division has become more important than ever before, and develops a self-consciousness of its own. This extension of feeling and organization keeps step with the new organized state, which is replacing the

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

tiny village republics of local self-government.

But local pride is still the tap-root of English nationality, and I shall not forget the inhabitants of Stratford as they gathered around the public notices that recorded the performances of the "Warwickshires." In the early days of the war the German chanted "Deutschland," but the Tommy sang of Leicester Square. Just now "Blighty" is the word. Soon it will be some other phrase, but always it will tell of a little place, a city street or a country lane.

CHAPTER VI

LLOYD-GEORGE

I HAVE recently come from a long talk with Mr. Lloyd-George. What he convinced me of was that he understands and cares for our country. Frankly, I had doubted this. I was left subdued by his militant interview on "Hands Off," which was harsh and necessary, but which did not bind Downing Street, London, to First Avenue, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. For two years I had wished that an English statesman would lift clear of his business with the enemy and give a word for neutral public opinion. Lloyd-George talked and listened for an hour and three quarters on the one subject of the middle West of America. He understands the people. He knows that the public policy of the nation is determined there. He knows that our democratic experiment is being decided by the prairie States. He quoted a remark of Henry Ford not with amusement or scorn, but as significant. By that

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

he revealed that he knows more about the real America than half the editors of Eastern newspapers.

He understands America with the same sympathy which Lincoln showed for the Lancashire cotton operatives in his famous letter to them. Lloyd-George has the same desire for a frank presentation of facts that Henry Ward Beecher revealed in his appeals to the British public in the industrial cities. What he wishes is that our people should hold the same sympathy with the struggle of the European democracies that the working-classes of England learned to feel for our Civil War struggle, after Lincoln and Beecher had made clear to them that we were fighting for human liberty. Mr. Lloyd-George does not regard the war as a dog-fight or as a sporting proposition. He sees it as an incalculable tragedy. With his Celtic imagination he lives in a profound sense of the pity and the waste of it. He has as little hate and bitterness as the soldiers of England and France with whom I have lived at the front.

He has a habit of informal breakfast at a sunny little flat about ten minutes away from Downing

LLOYD-GEORGE

Street. Here two or three of his friends meet him. He comes in well rested, and decides points of policy and indulges in reminiscence, amusing and poetic. And all his talk has a lightness of touch. The guests of this morning were Mr. Davies, the war secretary; Seebohm Rowntree, the manufacturer and social worker, whose books on the study of poverty are as well known in America as in England; and H. N. Spalding. Mr. Rowntree and Mr. Spalding are conducting the department of welfare work in the ministry of munitions.

“Are you giving them welfare?” he asked Mr. Rowntree. “Here,” he said, turning to me, “is the greatest attempt ever made by a government to surround the lives of the workers with safeguards for their safety and health and well-being.”

“What Americans and English need more than any one thing else is a smoking-room acquaintance, where they exchange their views informally and get to know the man.”

It is this smoking-room intimacy that Mr. Lloyd-George gives to all whom he meets. He is not afraid of being himself. He is as daring

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

in his comments on men and things as Mr. Roosevelt, as charming as the late William James. He is used to being loved. The lines about the eyes reveal a man who works his purpose by geniality in a flow of fun and charm and sympathy. The political battles of twenty years have left less impression on his spirit than the victories he has won as peace-maker and harmonizer. He referred to two editors who have recently been attacking him. He said:

“I don’t mind their criticizing me. I can take blows and I can give them. But they are making it hard for us to get together after the war. We don’t want differences when we come to the work of reconstruction.”

He ends a talk by being more completely the master of your thought than you are yourself. He states it clearly and beautifully, and reduces it to a program of action.

“To understand your people or any people,” he said, “it is necessary for one to pass inside the temple.”

He practises what Sainte-Beuve preached, that to know a religion you must be a worshiper inside the church. So week by week Sainte-

LLOYD-GEORGE

Beuve became a mystic and a pagan and an epicurean as he served up the soul of the writer whom he was interpreting. This is the high gift which Lloyd-George possesses. He can step up to the very altar of a man's most secret belief. This is the gift which has made him the one Briton who is perfectly understood in France. He spoke only a couple of sentences inside the citadel of Verdun, but they revealed to France that he knew what that symbol meant to them. For in his best moments he becomes something other than the grim fighter, and the adroit politician who uses all the tricks of the game. Suddenly for his hearers, and unexpectedly to himself, he lifts by an exquisite imagination to the place of insight, and becomes the voice of obscure people, and understands men he has never met. If he talks with a slangy person, he discharges himself in vivid, staccato phrases. The nature and direction of his rebound are determined by the substance that he encounters. He was born to react. He has a mind that kindles, and a style that rises very lightly and gracefully into poetic beauty. There has been no such passage of prose produced by the war as that para-

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

graph of his on “little nations” at the beginning of the fight.

A breezy young officer of the flying service once told me the shameful secret of Lloyd-George. It was that the war minister went around obtaining advice from experts, that he really didn’t know all about it by himself.

Earlier in the war a prominent banker told me that the then chancellor of the exchequer was not the financial authority which the multitude thought him, that he held consultations with leading bankers, that, in fact, the chancellor had consulted with his own firm.

Lloyd-George is the leader of a democracy because he chums with experts, and swings to the currents of the collective will. His personality contains the virtues and the perils of the democracy itself. For it, too, may some day establish a bureaucracy of experts that could be the tightest little oligarchy of history, and it, too, may yet swing to tides that are ebbing. It is not often that one sees a community incarnating itself in a single man. But the British democracy has its incarnation in Lloyd-George, responsive

LLOYD-GEORGE

to vast subconscious forces, and turning to specialists for aid in crises.

He faces the most difficult years of his life, and he knows it. A man of his temperament can conduct a great war. All that was needed was the inspirational quality to rouse his people, the energy to set them at work, the creative imagination to see the war in its extent, its duration, its requirements. None of these tests has overtaxed his powers, for they all lay inside the area of his competence. But when peace comes, there is no longer one straight road to a clear goal. All the forces of reaction will coalesce. All the bad counselors will make a cloud of witness about him. All the paths to immediate power will lie in "playing safe." If he remains true to himself, he will be cursed with a vehemence which will make his early years seem a sweet season of delight. There will be no easy victories. All will be turmoil and bitterness, for we are at the beginning of the greatest fight of the ages—the fight of the democracies inside themselves. We had our little Lloyd-George in America, a well known former district-attorney of New York. He had the same transcendent

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

charm. But the wrong crowd got him, not by illicit means. They won him on his social side, the quality in the man that likes people and wishes to be liked. And he lost his sense of direction. He forgot the long, hard fight he was making to give the people better government.

The coming years of Lloyd-George will be determined by the kind of persons who surround him, and touch that sensitive, quivering mind to action. If he holds fast to his good Welsh friends and to men like Dr. Clifford, the sturdy old radical warrior of nonconformity, he will go simply all his days, and continue to express the living element of his people. But if he leans toward the men of power, and listens to those voices, who will tell him of the kingdoms of this world, and who will promise him the leadership of a reactionary militaristic Tory party, he will lose his own soul. For the genius of the man is his human sympathy. He was meant to be a pathfinder for feet too tired to win their own way into the open. He was meant to think himself inside the mind of other men and other races.

The future rests with him as with no other single man among the Western peoples. He

LLOYD-GEORGE

will face a world no longer sharply defined into enemies, allies, and neutrals, but a world where unguessed tendencies are forming, and new forces of emancipation are fighting for recognition. We have this to go on for hope: Lloyd-George is a democrat by temperament and he understands America.

VALE

I HAVE sought in this book to show the passing of England,—Little England, Old England,—the crumbling of its caste system, and the emergence of the England of John Bull and Cromwell's soldiers from inarticulateness into power. And a yet greater thing has come—the advent of the new British commonwealth. Democratic control is being established. Labor is taking over the management of society. The women have gone out to win their world, and they face a bitter struggle. The book further records the wonderful rebirth of nationality in Ireland. It shows the machinery of joint boards, labor exchanges, workshop councils, imperial conference and franchise extension, by which the transformation will be worked. It tells of the terms of the new status for the masses: minimum wage, limitation of hours, choice of work, control inside the industry. Every change was long prepared for, and built out of age-old materials, and every change is made by compromise. But the change carries a long way, because the momentum is

VALE

continuous and along a straight line. After all, there is nothing so revolutionary as a great tradition, and the most daring reconstructors are often men of Tory blood.

So I have tried to show that this change is not a hasty chance revolution, but the natural growth of the English tradition. The little vessel that contained that tradition has been broken, but the germinal principle has been scattered rather widely around the world. I think that the book has coherence, because the theme is the principle of democratic control. It is this principle which is shattering the caste system, reconstructing industry, emancipating women, stirring Ireland, seething through the colonies, making England an industrial democracy, and transforming the far-flung empire into the British commonwealth.

I think I have made plain that the program of reconstruction is far from victorious attainment. The woman's movement bristles with unanswered questions. Labor has failed to develop its experts and leaders, and when it does, there remains the intricate problem of democratic control, with a set of experts sitting at the inner wheels. Freedom is a hard taskmaster. And deeper yet is the

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

problem of what excellence shall be made of the life that is free.

I am painfully aware of failure in giving my account. I have had to use only three years of observation and five months of writing on what ought to be the work of a lifetime. It was my wish to keep the record free from praise or blame, and to let it tell of principles and tendencies in a community of great variety. But to my own knowledge I have often failed to capture what is characteristic. There is something perdurable and continuing about British character. No outer violence can shake the citadel of the individual soul. The Briton is not only willing to die in what is plainly a great matter, such as the freeing of Belgium, he is willing to be laughed at and to be put into prison for his private pet belief. He interrupts public meetings and deposes leaders if the speaker or the representative outpaces the plain man's view of what is common sense. There is no British type. There are many types, and then, in between the composite, a multitude of "infinitely repellent particles." That individualism, which was in the race in Chaucer's time, and again found record in Ben

VALE

Jonson's "The Man of Humour," has never died, and no "collective will" or state control will ever rob the British democracy of the salt and tang of its variety, the loud protest of its protestants and the dissidence of its dissent. So I have rendered official stupidities with Ireland and the Russian refugees. But the final truth does n't rest there. I remember a talk I had with the mayor of the largest sea-coast resort, and how he told me of returning a German lad to his home-country after the war broke out. There is a kindness in the race. Many times I have been irritated by something pig-headed and unconsciously arrogant in the people, the quality which Havelock Ellis describes when he says, "It is the temper of a vigorous, independent, opinionated, free-spoken, yet sometimes suspicious people among whom every individual feels in himself the impulse to rule." It springs from the tradition of a governing class, and I once heard one of the most famous men in Europe tell how a certain English nobleman always made him feel: "You belong to a race which we once ruled. Really, we ought to be ruling you now." Then there comes to me the intimate talk I recently had with a librarian.

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

"For five generations my family has been in the public service," he said, "and I could not be happy elsewhere. I receive five hundred pounds a year. Recently, a business house offered me nine hundred pounds, with the promise of promotion. But I could not be happy in other work. We do not want money, primarily, so long as there is security, and enough for a decent living, and a pension, perhaps, at the end of it all. What can money offer compared with public service?"

That is the secret of what is best in English life: the finest men in public service, a level of conduct, clean administration and government. The democracy must never lower that standard.

For the opportunity of meeting the moving spirits of the reconstruction, the leaders of labor, welfare work, the woman's movement, cabinet ministers, writers, officials, I owe grateful thanks to H. N. Spalding, Seebohm Rowntree, and Geoffrey Butler. They were tireless in effecting new connections for me, unaware that they themselves were among the most valuable of the group whom I met. And from the many talks I have

VALE

seemed to verify what I have long believed—that the British people are a great democratic force in the world. I believe that in accomplished reform they are a generation ahead of the United States, and that they see more clearly than we the immense responsibilities which the principle of democratic control creates.

I am convinced that our own future is bound up with that of England, that together with England and France we can face the world with security, and gradually and painfully make the democratic principle prevail. I am convinced that, divided, both England and America will be fatally weakened, and that the future will be poorer because of the split. What is needed is interpretation of each country to the other, leading to intellectual understanding, and finally to good-will. For that common understanding I consider it of importance that England shall conquer a certain arrogance, a certain unwillingness to accept us as grown-up, and that she shall clear the Irish situation. For that common understanding I consider it of equal importance that America should cease her policy of aloofness, and

INSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES

overcome the self-complacency which believes that our country alone is the land of freedom and justice and the champion of democracy. Then, together, in humility, we can achieve greatness, and extend the principle of democratic control.

APPENDIX

IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT

In an outline of the new imperial commonwealth to which Lord Milner has given his approval the functions of the imperial parliament are suggested:

The first of these is the support and maintenance of the navy and naval establishments and fortifications throughout the empire. The second is the control of the expeditionary army and the maintenance of a skeleton military establishment for the empire by which the national-service militias that must certainly follow this war could be gunned, mobilized, and directed in an imperial crisis. The third is the imperial control of the food-supply and of the imperial resources of raw material. The fourth is imperial transit, posts, money, standards, ports, and seaways. The fifth is the common imperial trade policy. The sixth is the supreme direction of education, not with any power of prohibition, but with unlimited powers of endowment, to maintain the common language and the supply of higher education universally throughout the empire. The seventh is the maintenance of the supreme court of the empire. The eighth is the control of foreign policy and the continuation of the imperial trusteeship over the non-represented dependencies.

THE LABOR COLLEGE

The modern British radical is a man in command of the figures in his industry. His wage demand is not a blank check drawn against the full productive power of industry. It is an exact statement of the amount of cash which the employer has just put into his own pocket. This type of worker is perfectly willing to hold a conference on the basis of a show-down of facts. This mental clarity is not true

APPENDIX

of the mass of labor, but it is true of the advanced groups. Education has been at work and has given them an intellectual basis for their desires. Those desires, expressed in the form of demands, are less noisy and more deadly than the old class-conscious battle-cries. There is an atmosphere of smokeless powder to the syndicalist movement in the hands of the miners, railwaymen, and engineers.

An admirable study of this intellectual ferment in the South Wales coal-fields has been recently made by a special correspondent of "The Times." He shows how the miners, when they tackle Lord Rhondda and the other barons of the collieries, figure out costs from statistics, and challenge their management to a joint audit. In describing the careful preparation which these men have received, he says:

What is it that makes South Wales the industrial storm-center of Great Britain and why is it a fruitful ground for food agitation and peace propaganda? The answer is simple. Subject a fiery and educated people to a soulless, dehumanized, commercial machine for the extraction of gold out of labor, and you will inevitably breed a seething discontent which must somewhere find its outlet.

Their fieriness is sufficiently known, but the Celtic temperament alone does not explain their violence of action. To it is added a degree of education which would astonish some of their absentee employers. There are scores of men working in the Welsh pits who could pass an examination in Ibsen or Shaw or Swinburne, or could hold their own in an argument on economics or polities with the average member of Parliament. They owe their training, not to the state or to the municipalities, but to the educational facilities provided by the Independent Labor Party and other organizations. In the current number of the "Merthyr Pioneer," which may be regarded as the organ of the Independent Labor Party movement in South Wales, appears a column and a half article, one of a series, on industrial history, dealing with the earliest written records of British history from the point of view

APPENDIX

of the worker, and at the end of the article is a reference to the works which bear on the subject. For years past free evening classes in economics, industrial history, and similar subjects have been held in I. L. P. branch-rooms in the various mining centers, and many of the younger members have taken full advantage of them.

There is another educational movement which has its center in Rhondda, and which is carried on mainly by past students of the Central Labor College. This institution, it may be remembered, was established as the result of dissatisfaction with the curriculum of Ruskin College, Oxford. From Oxford it was transferred to Earl's Court, London, and thence it has spread the doctrine of class war far and wide. Recently it came under the joint control of the South Wales Miners' Federation and the National Union of Railwaymen, and special efforts are now being made to extend its work throughout this district, chiefly by lectures in the workmen's institutes and coöperative societies' rooms.

A third educational agency is an organization called the Plebs League, which aims at the education of the workers by means of classes in sociology, industrial history, Marxian economics, and so on. Not only do hundreds of young miners absorb this teaching, but many of them are sent by their lodges to the Central Labor College, London, and come back to preach what they have learned—mainly as a gospel of open hostility to the employers and constant agitation for the complete extraction of their profits.

The Central Labor College, described above, is an institution in the west of London, one of the heads of which has been Mrs. Bridges Adams. Mrs. Adams is an international Socialist, who has made a lifelong study of education. She and others founded Bebel House in London, which was to be one of the headquarters of the international socialist movement. Then came the war, and Bebel House was used by the refugee Russians as a headquarters. The police raided it during one of their stupid official campaigns against Russian political refugees. Mrs. Adams has waged a continuous and at last a successful fight against the English official betrayal of the right of asylum. I give a full

APPENDIX

account of the matter in the chapter entitled "The Right of Asylum." The point is of interest here as showing how various expressions of radicalism interlock. The woman who has helped the miners of South Wales to fashion the weapons of their powerful syndicalist movement is the person who has defended an ancient English liberty.

Mrs. Adams believes that little trust can be put in labor leaders. They grow official, tame and compromising, and lose responsiveness to the aspirations of the mass of the people. She believes that only by diffused intelligence will the labor movement prosper, and not through individual men becoming under secretaries, pension minister, and minister of labor. And this distrust of labor leaders she extends to university movements for "the education of the workers." She fears that they will make the social movement "upper class," and the education itself a desiccated, carefully edited non-explosive brand. So Mrs. Adams and others have conducted the Central Labor College as an institution growing out of the people themselves rather than something given them from above. Step by step with the growth of her institution and other democratic agencies of education the Welsh miners have raised their standard of living and strengthened their position in the community, till to-day they are a force so formidable that the Government capitulated on their latest threat to strike, and enforced a wage increase. They are probably the most radical labor group in Great Britain.

LAND

The Duke of Sutherland has decided to sell his Shropshire seat, Lilleshall, an estate of 7500 acres.

In a letter to the tenants the Duke writes:

I have hoped against hope that I might not be forced to part

APPENDIX

with what remains of the Lilleshall Estate, but the burden of taxation, which I think is heaviest on a landlord whose patrimony consists mainly of large landed properties, and particularly the very heavy death duties consequent on the death of my father, have compelled me to take this step. The prospect of a severance from the property and old association, which have become so dear to me, is a bitter one.

The war has delayed much good reform which was briskly on its way. A long campaign to bring man and land together was about to end in remedial legislation. Now these reforms have been postponed till peace comes. But legislation will be introduced after the close of the war to bring labor back to the land, and to bring the land back from grass. The famous "New Doomsday" inquiry showed that slightly more than 2000 persons owned half the agricultural land of the country.

While that investigation was being made the agricultural laborers were struggling to combine for higher wages, and their union was shortly afterwards crushed by farmers, clergy and landowners. As yet little has been done to efface the deep impress made alike upon the land system and the workers on the land by two hundred years of rule by the British landed aristocracy.

Ninety per cent. of the agricultural land of England and Wales is worked by tenants and not by owners. The net agricultural output of England and Wales is about \$650,000,000 a year. The land is under-cultivated.

The Government appointed The Land Inquiry Committee to find out why. Their report was brought in only a few months before the war. The changes they advocate were thus postponed.

The Committee found that one reason of under-cultivation is the insecurity of tenure of the farmer. The growing frequency of sales of agricultural estates, with notices to quit, or a higher rent, has led to this insecurity of the

APPENDIX

small holder. This insecurity of tenure prevents the tenant from making improvements. He deserves compensation for increased fertility due to continuous good farming. Instead, he often is shackled with a higher rent for his own improvements, and under the present system of taxation these improvements are rated and therefore penalized.

Another reason is labor. Bad farming and low wages together have driven many of the best men to the towns. Those who remain as laborers are underpaid.

A large amount of land is withheld from its best use for the purpose of sport, and a considerable amount more is under-cultivated and in some cases under-rented owing to game preservation. This land, instead of providing food for the people, provides sport and delicacies for the few. Between 1881 and 1901, the number of game-keepers increased from 12,633 to 16,677, while during the same period there was a large decline in the rural population. There are instances of agricultural land, formerly rated at 20 shillings or more an acre, turned into plantation, and then rated at one shilling an acre, including the sporting right. In such cases the law has put a premium upon misusing the land. Reforms are necessary in taxation and rating of this land used for sport.

Other reasons for under-cultivation follow: Land lies waste. The farmer can not obtain adequate capital nor facile credit. Better transit by light railways, waterways, etc., is needed. Coöperation is still imperfectly practised. Scientific education is required. Much of the land must be split into small holdings. Too much land is in pasture instead of tillage. Even in dairy farming, "more cows could be maintained, and, if they are properly managed, more profit obtained, on an arable farm than on a grass farm." The "Nation" has reduced the total area in England and

APPENDIX

Wales under crops and grass to the scale of 48 acres, and, according to the latest agricultural returns, shown its division. Twenty-nine acres are in permanent grass, five acres clover and rotation grasses, 14 acres arable.

The Government Committee came to this revolutionary conclusion:

The ownership of land is of the nature of a monopoly, and the legal power which a landowner has over his tenant, tempered though it be in many cases by goodwill and kindly personal relationship, is detrimental to the best national interests. . . . England has become, more than any other European nation, a country of farms of over 50 acres as opposed to Small Holdings. Nearly 7,000,000 acres are in the hands of large farmers who hold more than 300 acres, while only 4,000,000 are in holdings between 5 and 50, and only 285,000 acres are in holdings between 1 and 5 acres.

Small holdings are one of the remedies. English experience shows conclusively, according to these Government investigators, that small holders would rather rent than purchase. Their report is unfavorable to state-aided purchase. They found that the desire to purchase is not for any abstract joy of ownership, but almost universally for the factor of obtaining security of tenure. An inquiry was made among farmers. Eighty per cent. stated that they wished security of tenure, only $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent said that their real object was the satisfaction of ownership. So the remedy proposed is to create security of tenure, rather than peasant proprietorship. It should be said that there is a wide difference of public opinion on this point of small rented holding versus peasant proprietorship. The Committee sees that one of the fundamentals in the matter is that the man with only a small capital needs a good return on his money. Land as an investment pays back only about 3 per cent. This is too small a return for the farmer. He

APPENDIX

will do better to rent his holding, and invest his money in seed, fertilizer and machinery. Land is more costly than its agricultural value warrants because there is a demand for it for social and sporting purposes.

The Committee urges that Land Courts shall be established in England and Wales with powers to grant security of tenure subject to good farming, to fix fair rents, to decide questions of compensations, and to fix the price payable upon compulsory acquisition of land by public bodies. The existence of this Land Court will hasten the acquisition of land by public bodies for small holdings.

Ordinary agricultural laborers in England make an average around \$4.20 a week. There is little opposition to the proposal that a legal minimum wage shall be established for them by a wage tribunal. This wage must be such as will enable the laborer to live in a state of physical efficiency and to pay a commercial rent for his cottage.

For his bad condition is partly due to bad housing. The number of cottages for the working class in the rural districts of England and Wales is about 1,200,000. One hundred and twenty thousand new cottages are needed, especially cottages with three bedrooms. By "bad housing in rural districts thousands of children and adults are dying or being permanently injured in health every year. . . . It should be made a definite statutory duty of every Rural District Council to provide a cottage for every person permanently employed in a rural district."

By thus increasing the independence of the laborer, he will be in a position to take advantage of the existent Small Holdings and Allotments Act. This, combined with better machinery, through Parish Councils and Government officials, will secure the use of a small piece of land for every dweller in the countryside. In that way the ladder is built

APPENDIX

by which he rises from a landless underpaid wage-slave to a free householder with access to the land.

It is further advocated that the Crown Land Commissioners purchase large areas of land in different parts of the country for the purpose of extending their policy of creating small holdings.

Who is to pay for the minimum wage of labor and the reduced rent of small holdings? The landlord, not the farmer. The legislation for a minimum wage is to provide that the farmer who pays it and who is able to prove that the rise in wages has put upon him an increased burden shall have the right to apply to the Land Court for a readjustment of his rent. And that rent, in any case, is to be a fair rent and not a competitive rent.

"A competitive rent is the sum which one farmer, competing with other farmers, will pay for land rather than go without it. A fair rent is the surplus which in a normal season will remain over from the produce of the land if worked by a farmer of average ability, after providing for all necessary outgoings, including a fair wage to the laborer, and after allowing to the farmer a reasonable remuneration."

In these ways, bad housing, over-crowding, malnutrition, tuberculosis will be done away with in the life of the laborer, and the land itself freed for community service. In the reform, two points of view will be kept in mind—"The social point of view, which looks on the health and housing of the laborer and the poorer villager; the economic point of view which treats agriculture as an industry that must be run at a profit."

It is historically just that the landowner shall stand a portion of the burden of reform. Dr. Gilbert Slater has outlined the process by which the self-respecting English

APPENDIX

peasantry were forced off the land. By rack rents (an economic rent based on rising values, as distinguished from the customary rent), by a system of fines, the landlords appropriated to themselves the whole of the new profits of changed conditions through world commerce. The tenants resigned their holdings into the hands of the landlord. The arable land was turned into sheep farms, evictions were widely made, and a thriving village would be replaced by "ruined cottages, and rough grass nibbled by flocks, running, we are told, in some cases to as many as 24,000 sheep, tended by a few shepherds and their dogs. This was the great enclosure movement of the sixteenth century."

Enclosure was not the turning of waste lands into cultivated fields, but the conversion of arable fields into desolate sheep walks.

"Early in the eighteenth century began the series of private acts of enclosure, of which 4000 in all, covering 7,000,000 acres, were passed before the General Enclosure Act of 1845. During the same period it is probable that about the same area was enclosed without application to Parliament. . . . In a proportion of cases, the principal landowner effected enclosure by first of all making himself the sole proprietor."

Enclosure meant throwing open fields together and building a hedge around the total. In this way the small owners were got rid of. "The majority of the small tenant farmers had to choose between emigrating elsewhere, or becoming landless laborers. . . . Henceforward there was a gulf between the laborer and the farmer."

EMPIRE RESOURCES

I have to limit myself to a sentence for programs of reconstruction, each of which would require a volume for ade-

APPENDIX

quate summary. The linking up of the resources of the empire is a vast scheme, with a committee already at work upon it. The empire resources development committee has been formed to open up new sources of revenue by developing the empire through state aid to private enterprise. Selected resources, assets ripe for development. Land, palm-oil products, fisheries are among its immediate agenda. Land will be sold or leased, and will also be used as an instrument of production, for stock-raising, and the establishment of plantations. Water-supplies, railways, harbors, grain-elevators, and factories are all envisaged in the scheme. The development board is to be constituted of captains of industry. Among the men backing the plan are Rudyard Kipling, Sir Horace Plunkett, Dunraven, Grey, Selborne Desborough, and Sir Starr Jameson.

It is impossible for the empire to pay off its enormous war debt under the existing system of taxation. Democratic finance has to strike out new ideas, and this is one of them: to make use of the "finest undeveloped estate which has ever been known in the history of the world," and to develop these latent resources of the empire by a centralized semi-state board, making use of the services of experts. This organization will thus be a commercial pioneer, supplying capital and knowledge, control and organization, to the scattered pockets and pools and paying veins of the ungarnered wealth of a quarter of the earth.

Alfred Bigland, who has had forty years of experience in the importation of raw materials, says of the plan:

Some time ago the Minister of Munitions asked me to take charge of all oils that contained glycerine and he pointed out the Government controlled the whole of the whale fishing in the Antarctic Ocean. By giving licenses to the men to fish in these waters on condition that the oil was retained for this country we have received during the war 660,000 barrels of this oil. It was

APPENDIX

a revelation that we had such a supply, and while the Germans were paying, for little lots, £300 a ton for such oil, we are buying it for the Government at £38 a ton.

In the Pacific Ocean, bordering on British Columbia; in the mouth of the St. Lawrence; and the waters around Newfoundland and Labrador, apart from our own home waters—under an Empire monopoly (though we must have the consent of the dominions in this matter), we could become the purveyors of fish in all forms, almost to the whole world. Already Newfoundland was sending on an average 300,000 tons of cod to the Mediterranean and neutral countries. There was practically no limit to the quantity, and the Grand Trunk Pacific had already offered refrigerating plant to bring fish from Prince Rupert Island to Liverpool at a penny a ton, which would be reduced to three farthings or a halfpenny on big Government contracts being entered into. This development could take place immediately. The necessary shipbuilding and equipment must take time, but after the war—if the Government allowed it—the whole of the vessels now used in the North Sea for mine sweeping and other purposes would form the nucleus of an Empire fishing fleet. The quantity of fish consumed in this country was 600,000 tons a year, which was equal to one-fortieth of the total food consumed per head of the population, and the scheme might increase the fish supply to at least four times that quantity.

It will take ten years to develop the ideas the committee wish to carry out. It must be apparent to every one that no private individual could accomplish such a great work in the way that an Empire Council could do. There was the objection that it would be Socialistic for the State to carry on such a business; but the committee would begin where vested interests were the least in force—except as regarded the fishermen engaged in the business—and that was in the bed of the ocean. All on board the fishing vessels, from the captain to the lowest man, should participate in the proceeds of the catches. If the State secured a penny a pound, which was £9 6s. a ton, it would be quite possible to make a gross profit in 10 years of £36,000,000, out of which the sinking fund for the development charges must be met. It would be for the State to regulate the prices in every town in the country; and the State should have the control of the home fisheries as well.

APPENDIX

Sir William Lever has stated that an expenditure of ten thousand dollars in bringing two hundred acres of cocoanut-palms to maturity may be estimated to give an income of ten thousand dollars an acre in about ten years. So it will be an immense source of income for the state to develop the vast imperial holdings of palm-lands, which probably amount to several million acres.

WHO DOES THE WORK?

The question has been often asked, How has it been possible to take out four million men and still carry on the productive industries of Great Britain?

The clearest shortest answer to this has been given by Sir Leo Chiozza Money:

- (1) The men remaining have, as a whole, produced more than in peace.
- (2) There has been a better organization of production in some trades, notably the engineering trades.
- (3) Large amounts of new capital have been applied by the Government to many important industries.
- (4) There has been a removal of restrictions upon output.
- (5) Many women have taken up productive work for the first time.
- (6) There has been a great contraction of the vast amount of male labor normally employed upon non-productive and uneconomic work; in some cases the unnecessary work has disappeared altogether; in others it has been taken up and is now performed by women or girls.

He goes on to say:

Before the war a very large proportion of our male workers were engaged in non-productive work. All our mines, quarries, mills, factories, and workshops employed only $4\frac{1}{4}$ million men. But our male population aged eighteen years and upwards numbered thirteen millions. Therefore it was true that OF OUR MALE POPULATION AGED EIGHTEEN YEARS AND

APPENDIX

OVER ONLY ABOUT ONE IN THREE WAS ENGAGED DIRECTLY IN PRODUCING INDUSTRIAL WEALTH.

What were all the rest doing? Distribution, education, Government service, commerce, etc., are all important, but can it be possible that two out of three males—to say nothing of females—were needed to carry them on, as compared with only one in three devoted to producing things? Most certainly the devotion of so large a proportion of males to non-productive tasks was not only unnecessary, but a sign and a portent of industrial decadence.

The taking of men from non-productive employments has enabled women very easily to make substitution in many cases. A woman works the lift which before the war was worked by an able-bodied man, doing work which no able-bodied man should ever do. The laundry van, which before the war was driven by an able-bodied man, is now driven by a girl. You go to the bank and see capable young women dealing with the books and papers which yesterday were supposed to demand the services of stalwart young men.

At the insurance offices, which before the war employed a great army of young men, girls find no difficulty in accomplishing the work. At the offices of the National Health Insurance Commissioners the work is being done by girls quite as well as by the battalion or so of men who recently were thought to be needed for it. In tens of thousands of commercial, Government, and local government offices female labor is doing what the other year was thought to be men's work.

The idea, therefore, that because a man was a petty clerk, or a shop assistant, or a lift-man, or a driver, or a door-opener, or a tout, or a commission agent, or something of that sort, before the war, he must necessarily go back to his old job, while the woman who has taken his job is to return to her old work, is entirely mistaken.

Organize our power supply; reform our railway system; set to work on a decent canal system; determine production in the metal trades and the chemical trades; enlarge our wheat area definitely and compulsorily. Do these things, and there will be such a call for labor in connection with them, and in connection with other useful employments arising from them, that in peace as in war, we shall find that the difficulty is not to find jobs for the men, but to find men for the jobs.

APPENDIX

THE CHURCH

The City Temple, the leading Nonconformist church of England, believing that "the brotherhood of the trenches" might be extended to the Christian church, invited Dean Henson of Durham Cathedral, belonging to the Church of England, to preach in the City Temple pulpit. The dean consented. On January 31, 1917, "The Times" reports:

The York branch of the Yorkshire District Union of the English Church Union yesterday discussed the Dean of Durham's intention to preach in the City Temple. The Rev. P. J. Shaw, rector of All Saints', North-street, York, moved a resolution deplored the intention of Dean Henson, which he described as a flagrant violation of Church order and discipline. The motion was carried.

COMPULSORY DEMOCRACY

Mr. Balfour has stated the present concentration of effort in clear terms:

All we can do for the war is to produce men to fight, men and women to work at warlike munitions, men and women to work at those commodities that we can export and with which we can buy abroad other munitions of war. If you divert by your expenditure national energies into wrong channels, by so much you are diverting resources on which we depend for finishing the war and ending it with a successful peace.

Let us transpose that into its equivalent for normal life.

All we can do for the welfare of the community is to produce happy and healthy persons to live a creative life, men and women to work at productive industries, men and women to work at those commodities that we can export and with which we can buy abroad other products for the creation of a life of reasonable satisfaction. If, by your expenditure on personal luxury or by your investment of capital on non-productive trades, you divert national energies into wrong channels, by so much you are diverting resources on

APPENDIX

which we depend for establishing a high standard of living for the community, and so finishing the labor war and ending it with a successful peace.

The principle of organization and concentration, backed by compulsion, in the interests of the community has for the first time in English history been widely applied. Once applied, it becomes permanent, and is subject to extension. The compulsion has been used to force men to go and die. It has been used to make them work at certain jobs at a fixed rate of pay and to give up other jobs. But it has not been used, except in "controlled" firms and in a limited way, to take control of profits, and it has not been used to force capital to invest in one enterprise and not in another. A man's life is not his own, his power of work is not his own; but his money, if he is wealthy, is his own. He can invest it in making absinthe; he can lend it to an exploiter of African labor; he can create an anti-social industry with it. One needs only to state it for its absurdity to be seen. Capital will be increasingly governed as labor is already governed. When political democracy was formed, it was inevitable that industrial democracy would result, however tardily. So it is with any partial application of a principle. Once it begins to operate, it gradually extends itself over the full area of its function. The principle of compulsion, applied to the life and labor of men, will a little later reach property, that last sacred stronghold of privilege.

These changes are more searching than the direct changes by death and wastage of the war, but it is the war that has hastened them. "The success of this revolution was chiefly due to the wisdom of those who allowed it to develop gradually and almost imperceptibly from existing institutions."

APPENDIX

COÖPERATION, SOCIALISM, SYNDICALISM

Private capitalism, in its old terms of unchecked profiteering and laissez-faire exploitation, has already been scrapped as a method of organizing industry. Individualism, with its instinct for property, will of course survive in many forms. Thus in agriculture we are to-day seeing a powerful movement toward the private ownership of property, and that property, instead of being held in a few hands, will be widely distributed. The restoration of peasant-land proprietorship in Ireland is an instance. The movement toward tenant holdings in England and Wales is another instance.

But industrial England is looking to other solutions than individualism for the mass of her workers, and has already put those solutions into partial operation. One of those solutions is democratic control of industry by the workers. That means precisely that associations of producers (trade-unions and guilds) will exercise control over the conditions of their work. I have outlined this solution in the chapter on "The Discovery." It is the solution by syndicalism.

The other solution is the control of industry by associations of consumers. Those associations are voluntary, as in coöperation, and compulsory, as in state and municipal ownership. This is the solution by coöperation and socialism. There is no difference in principle between coöperation and socialism, but there is a sharply marked difference in the area of application.

Every solution, whether by association of producers or by association of consumers, needs the check and balance of the other. The syndicalist will exploit the consumer by high prices and over-emphasis on the social value of his own particular trade. The coöperator and state socialist will

APPENDIX

exploit the worker in order to get products at a low price, and state socialism builds a powerful bureaucracy of expert officials, who form an oligarchy inside the democracy. The ineradicable instinct for property will temper both movements, and Parliament will remain one of the direct expressions of the people's wish between these contending forces, and will continue to act as a corrective of modern government, which is government by cabinet and committee, leaning increasingly toward state socialism. In short, no one movement or tendency fully expresses democracy, which must use each in carefully controlled degree. The method of that control is the problem of the future. The cabinet and the bureaucracy have meanwhile grown strong, and Parliament has weakened. In the future no one tendency inside the social movement is likely to be the Aaron's rod and swallow up the contending tendencies, though socialists, syndicalists, and coöperators make the same whole-hearted claims for their pet solution that advocates of big business, free trade, and empire development make. Out of all these powerful "pushes" will come a resultant, a collision into harmony, which will be the new order, the reconstructed community, the organized state under democratic control.

A figure will make this clear. In the warfare in France and Flanders there is a series of separate spaces that can be made untenable for the enemy. There are the differing zones of shrapnel and of infantry fire and a space between them, and that space belongs to the machine-gun. There is a similar division of effective function in the attack on the capitalistic system. There is an area that the municipal and governmental control of industry does not reach, and a portion (not the whole) of that area is reached by the co-operative movement. There is a further area reached by

APPENDIX

syndicalism. In the near future at least there will be left much "dead ground" of which private enterprise will still alone have the range.

Thus in the most careful study ever made of the co-operative movement, the report of the committee of the Fabian Research Department, the possible extent of the annual trade of the movement is put at "something like four to five hundred millions sterling, being only one-fifth of the total national production." Also, coöperation "offers in itself nothing in the nature of a complete solution of the problem of the status of the workers."

And so with the limitations of public ownership. Some of the coming trouble will be a fight of syndicalism against state socialism. The state, as manager of industry and employer of labor, operating through its bureaucracy of experts, will issue orders to its employees. They will claim the right to strike. Will they then be "called to the colors," as was done in the French syndicalist strike? Will the troops be ordered out against them, as is done in Colorado, Illinois, and Pennsylvania? Is the right to strike to be taken from government employees? If so, the socialistic state will become an oligarchy of expert officials possessing a tyrannical power. It will cease to be under democratic control. For the socialistic state is not the consummation of democracy; it is only one expression of democracy. And syndicalism is another expression. To no one expression can the full power be safely handed over.

What has coöperation in Great Britain done after seventy years of experience? It has established and has running at the present time fifteen distributive stores, with three million members, controlling sales to the value of four hundred million dollars a year, and producing goods

APPENDIX

to the value of seventy million dollars a year. The research committee summarizes the service of coöperation. It has afforded in manufacturing and in wholesale and retail trading an alternative of working-class origin to the capitalist system. Manual workers have proved themselves capable of administering it under democratic control. It has steadily grown for seventy years. It has kept down retail prices, distributed millions of dollars as dividend on purchases, money that would have gone to the capitalist class. By coöperation the manual workers are receiving a training in the administration of self-governing industrial republics. Coöperation within its own area has done away with that specialized brain power known as directive control, which consists in cunning for the defeat of rivals, under cutting, nibbling at wages, adulteration, cornering the market, promotion, stock-exchange gambling. A tendency in coöperation, as in socialism, is to put administration into the hands of salaried officials. Thus the English Coöperative Wholesale Society has twenty-one thousand paid employees, directed by a salaried committee of thirty-two members.

The business of coöperation is not likely to go far beyond the articles consumed by that portion of the wage-earning class enjoying fairly regular employment and wages, together with the "black-coated proletariat"—clerks, petty officials, and the like. The submerged tenth are unable to avail themselves of coöperation, and the one-eighth or one-tenth of the population known as the middle and upper classes do not care to avail themselves of it. But it is those other classes, from unskilled laborer to minor professionals, with incomes from \$250 to \$2000 a year, who are increasing in numbers and importance, and who are entering into control of the new social order. Coöperation

APPENDIX

as an association of consumers will probably not touch the greater part of agriculture, the greater part of manufacture for foreign consumption, the industries providing material and plant for other industries, and those industries, like the post-office and the railway system, in which the day-by-day consumers do not constitute a suitable unit of administration, or in which administration by the compulsory machinery of national or municipal government is required. Accordingly, four-fifths of national production will remain outside the reach of coöperative organization. Coöperation is not an alternative to the capitalist system for a majority of manual workers. It is an alternative for a minority.

What has socialism done? The summary was given by the Fabian Research Committee in the late spring of 1915. Government has already become socialistic. It has outgrown its police power alone and has become an administration of public services—housekeeping on a national scale. How are we to know the difference between governmental and capitalist enterprise? The test of whether administration in a given department and area is socialistic is whether any excess of receipts over cost of working goes not to the profit of the administrators or of any private owner or shareholders, but to public purposes. Down to a century ago government concerned itself with provision for religious rites, external defense, police, the administration of justice, and the maintenance of prisons, poor relief, regulation, inspection, audit, and taxation. Since then government has entered many fields.

It has entered the domain of communication and transport, transmitting communications, conveying persons, and transporting commodities. This industry employs at least one-tenth of all the working population, and absorbs

APPENDIX

an expenditure of a thousand million dollars a year. This largest of all industries in its three functions is passing increasingly throughout the civilized world into governmental organization. Thus the inland conveyance of letters by private enterprise is to-day left to countries like Abyssinia, Afghanistan, and Arabia.

The construction and maintenance of roads is virtually nowhere a service of private capitalism. The United Kingdom is now spending yearly nearly one hundred million dollars on thoroughfares, with approximately 100,000 men constantly employed.

Local authorities in Great Britain in 1913 were operating 171 tramways as against one in 1881. In 1913 the municipal capital in tramways was \$275,000,000.

In waterways, embanking, lighting, watching, ports, the docks and quays are nearly everywhere provided and maintained by government. The capital outlay in Great Britain is over five hundred million dollars.

Of the total railway mileage of the world, just about half is owned and worked entirely by government enterprise. The railways of Great Britain have been in the hands of private capital, but during the war the Government has controlled them, and there is a powerful movement toward nationalizing them. This movement resulted a few weeks ago in nationalizing the railways of Ireland.

In public health and sanitary work we see in local-government water undertakings of Great Britain twenty thousand men employed, and a thousand million dollars administered in premises, plant, and machinery.

The removal of house refuse, city drainage, and street sweeping are increasingly governmental services.

Public baths, public laundries, and swimming-pools repre-

APPENDIX

sent a municipal investment in Great Britain of twenty-five million dollars.

State medical service is steadily spreading: doctoring for the destitute, governmental insurance systems, public medical service in universities, hospitals, asylums, schools, prisons, health departments, workhouses, army, navy, police, post-office. Nurses, chemists, and doctors are rapidly becoming the officers of the community. Where already perhaps one hundred thousand of them are in public institutions and government departments the rest will shortly be.

In land improvement, there are already over three hundred local commissioners of sewers, spending about two and a half million dollars a year. Several million dollars a year are spent in India in new irrigation canals, in improving the network of water-channels, in banking river channels. At this moment Ireland requires an expenditure of a few million dollars to drain her bogs, set her river-levels, and establish an irrigation system.

Public education, recreation, parks, libraries, music, dances, piers, museums, art galleries, government books and other printed matter, are all employing men and women and absorbing capital. The printing bill of the British Government alone is over five million dollars a year.

Banking facilities are passing under governmental control. Metallic coinage and the issue of paper money are state services. British post-office savings-bank deposits and trustee savings-bank deposits amount to twelve hundred and fifty million dollars. The British Government lends money to land-owners, local authorities, public-utility societies for agricultural improvements, drainage, and housing, and to the householder wishing to purchase his own home. In the purchase and sale of securities for customers the post-

APPENDIX

master-general of Great Britain does a business of millions a year. In 1915 the British Government took under its control the investment of capital. In 1914 the Bank of England, as the agent of the British Government, purchased over five hundred million dollars of bills of exchange.

In light, heat, and power the same tendency toward state and municipal ownership is at work. Over three hundred gas undertakings in Great Britain are municipal, and the capital is two hundred and twenty-five million dollars. The Widnes town council claimed four years ago that at from sixteen to twenty-four cents per thousand cubic feet it was supplying gas, with a profit, cheaper than any other gas plant, governmental or capitalist, in the world. Nearly three hundred cities and towns in Great Britain are now supplied with light, heat, and power by the municipal electrical department, representing an investment of two hundred and fifty million dollars, annual gross receipts of over twenty millions, and employing about twenty thousand persons.

Government has gone in for housing, building farm-laborers' cottages in Ireland, municipal lodging-houses in Great Britain, tenement blocks in London and Liverpool, and developing suburbs. As I show in the report of the Land Inquiry committee, there is beginning a vast extension of governmental rural cottage building, which will provide 120,000 new dwellings, or ten per cent. of the present number.

One-sixth of British India is forest reserve, a tract of 240,000 square miles, administered by the Government of India for the public benefit, producing a net revenue of ten million dollars a year. English municipalities are beginning to afforest their water-catchment areas.

APPENDIX

The largest farmer in the United Kingdom is the Irish Government, where the congested districts board has 33,000 rent-paying tenants and an average of a quarter of a million acres under its administration for stock and sale of produce.

The mines in the United Kingdom have been under private ownership. But the Government recently took over the coal mines in South Wales, and this is probably the first step in the nationalization of most of the fields. Ireland's prosperity will leap up if her coal-deposits are freed.

There are many government enterprises in manufacturing industry, producing the articles required for public use, instead of purchasing them to the profit of private concerns. The municipality, with its tramway service, erects its own works and car-sheds, generates its electricity, builds and repairs its cars, prints its tickets. In England the post-office gets the bulk of its mail-sacks made by the prison department.

At this writing the British Government is considering taking over the manufacture and sale of liquor, which will make it one of the greatest shopkeepers in the world.

In the face of this summary of the research committee, it is theoretic to debate about the principle of socialism *versus* private capitalism. The tendency toward public ownership is under full swing, and no phrases can stop it. The committee quotes what a secretary for the colonies, Lewis Harcourt, said:

In these days, the Colonial Office has more the attributes of an immense trading and administrative concern than those of earlier days, when it was a mere machine of Government. I am a coal and tin miner in Nigeria, a gold miner in Guiana. I seek timber in one colony, oil and nuts in another, cocoa in a third—copra and copal, sisal and hemp, cotton, coffee, tobacco are common objects of my daily care. . . . My days and nights are spent in the

APPENDIX

study of medicine, in the details of railway construction, with a desire that the smallest sum of money may lay the largest number of miles of track in the fewest possible days.

Six years ago the census showed in government employ in England and Wales 788,550 persons, 299,599 in state departments and 588,951 under local authorities. It is reasonable to estimate that in the United Kingdom over one million are now in public employment, one-sixth of all gainfully employed persons. The Socialist or Labor parties can not fully claim this government action as the result of their propaganda. The bulk of this socialist enterprise has been initiated and carried out by persons of the aristocratic or propertied classes, by business men and experts, and middle-class residents. Men like Joseph Chamberlain were not "out" to introduce the coöperative commonwealth, though unconsciously they have hastened its coming. The reasons that have directly led to this spread of socialism show that the consideration in the creators of the policy was the interest of the community as a whole and the interest of the citizens as consumers. The test of the policy is not by theory, but by practice and experience.

In four great fields both socialism and coöperation are as yet largely leaving the field to private capital. Those fields are: the special service of the idle rich, much of international trade and its finance, the unorganized portion of the shipping industry, and a large part of agriculture and fishing. And yet even in agriculture the coming legislation is leaning heavily toward what is virtually state control; and in fishing the Empire Resources Development committee are putting through a program which is socialistic.

State and municipal ownership and management now administer in the United Kingdom seventy-five hundred million dollars of capital. The capital thus administered

APPENDIX

and the volume of business thus done is probably a hundred times as great as that of coöperation, and is increasing with giant strides. This state and municipal socialism is most successful in communication and transport, land improvement, sanitation, and public health service, education and recreation, extraction of coal and other minerals, banking and insurance, manufacture and distribution of certain commodities, and the construction and preparation of articles required in the public service.

The enterprises of coöperation and of state and municipal socialism hardly ever compete with one another because their spheres are distinct. The Coöperative Society produces and distributes mainly ordinary household supplies. Socialism has devoted itself to commodities and services unsuited to coöperation. This division of function will undoubtedly long continue.

The more a government engages in industrial functions as contrasted with functions merely of police and national defense, the more essentially democratic does its administration tend to become. But as yet, parallel with what we have seen in coöperation, the humbler grades of employees in state and municipal service have as little influence on the management of their department and are as much governed from above as if they were in capitalist employment.

On the other hand, in comparison with joint-stock capitalism, government management of industry means ultimately a large number of independent employers and an increase in local control. And this because in practice there is a rapid growth of municipal enterprises, with a multiplication of separate employers. Whereas in capitalist enterprise there is the supremacy of the national trust and combine, such as Lord Rhondda's in South Wales, over private industry, thus lessening the number of employers.

APPENDIX

The extension of state and municipal management is rapidly proceeding, and its potential area of control is almost illimitable. In these next years if those industries and services already governmentally administered in one place or another are generally brought under public administration, the aggregate volume of state and municipal socialism will be increased probably five- or six-fold. Such an increase, without adding a single fresh industry or service to those already successfully nationalized or municipalized in one country or another, will probably bring into the service of national and local government an actual majority of the adult population. With coöperation developing along its own lines, the combination of socialism and coöperation will mean that probably three-fourths of all the world's industrial capital will be under collective or non-capitalistic administration.

Certain activities will long remain outside this extension of collective enterprise: certain branches of agriculture, art, invention, new markets, new individual enterprises. The future organization of industry and the state will therefore include more than one form of control. There is need to secure for persons employed in coöperation, in government enterprise, and in private enterprise some real control over their own working lives. With that method of control I have dealt in the chapter on "The Discovery." There is need, also, to secure for the users and consumers of particular products and services some real power of influencing their production otherwise than by Parliament and the town council.

Such are the conclusions of the research committee, which I have reproduced largely in their own words. Out of it all emerges the outline of the coming England, of socialism, coöperation, syndicalism, big business, private property.

APPENDIX

WORKSHOP COUNCILS

"Carels Frères" in Ghent, Belgium, had instituted a works committee before the war came. Questions of hours, piece rates, and discipline were dealt with. The disputes ceased, production increased, and higher wages were paid.

WORKERS' CONTROL

The Garton Foundation, of which Mr. Balfour, the Viscount Esher and Sir Richard Garton are the trustees, has made a careful investigation of industrial conditions:

Many of the men who return from the trenches to the great munition and shipbuilding centers are, within a few weeks of their return, among those who exhibit most actively their discontent with present conditions. Among those who have fought in Flanders or who have been employed in making shells at home, there are many who look forward to a great social upheaval following the war. It is the testimony of responsible observers on the spot that some of our greatest industrial centers are even now in a state of incipient revolt. To a very large number of the men now in the ranks, the fight against Germany is a fight against "Prussianism," and the spirit of Prussianism represents to them only an extreme example of that to which they object in the industrial and social institutions of their own country. They regard the present struggle as closely connected with the campaign against capitalist and class-domination at home.

Unfortunately some of the results of the war itself, such as the Munitions Act and the Compulsion Acts, have intensified this identification of external and internal "enemies." We are not discussing the necessity of these measures. The point is that the working of these Acts and the Tribunals created under them has given rise to an amount of deep and widespread resentment which is the more dangerous because it is largely inarticulate. It is particularly dangerous because it tends to discredit in general working class opinion that section of Labor which looks to the improvement of industrial conditions by negotiation or by legislative action, and to strengthen the hands of the party which preaches doctrines of wrecking and appropriation.

APPENDIX

The war has not put an end to industrial unrest. Every one of the old causes of dispute remains, and others of a more serious nature have been added in the course of the war. The very moderation and unselfishness shown by the responsible leaders of Organized Labor are looked upon by important sections of their following as a betrayal of the cause and by some employers as a tactical opportunity.

The employers know nothing of the effect of a new process on the nervous system of the worker. They know nothing of the fatigue from overwork or monotony. They make no study of a standard of living. They go blindly ahead, as if men and machinery, alike, were tools to be manipulated. That an aim of industry should be a good life for the worker is an idea which would sound strangely in the ears. The workers understand nothing of overhead charges, depreciation of plant, the risks of capital. They know nothing of the policy connected with buying and selling.

Consider the analysis Sir Hugh Bell has recently made of his own costs, as given in the "Round Table" for September, 1916:

His firm makes steel, the raw materials for which are produced from his own coal and iron mines and limestone quarries. In every ton of steel made 70 to 75 per cent. of the cost goes as the wages of labor. There remains 25 to 30 per cent. for all other outgoings, including profit. The turnover on a steel business in this country about equals the capital invested. If this profit amounts to 10 per cent., of which 3 per cent. at least must go back into the business to maintain the works, he thinks himself lucky, and the 7 per cent. left must cover interest on his capital as well as the profits for his enterprise and risk. The remaining 15 to 20 per cent. goes to cover rates and taxes, railway freights and so forth, part of which again goes to labor.

Out of what fund, as Sir Hugh Bell asks, is he to pay a 10 per cent. increase in wages? If he paid 10 per cent. more, he would have no profit at all and could not continue the business. The increase in wages, then, can only come from within, by greater

APPENDIX

efficiency in management or greater production per man. There are, no doubt, many businesses which have some monopoly value, where capital secures a greater return; there are others where the return is less and the business is decaying. But except when abnormal conditions arise, as with shipping now, or when a monopoly or a patent exists, the picture given by Sir Hugh Bell is more or less applicable to industry in general.

No paper resolution, no legislation, and no economic theory can alter the facts of the industrial situation. But an adjustment and a gain can be made by a new release of productive energy on the part of the management and the men, by consultation between labor and capital, and by hard intellectual effort put on each detail of both the industrial process and the industrial relationship.

Labor is going to demand higher wages. To obtain them, labor must produce more goods, and the employer must improve his methods, instal new machinery, and consult the worker. Some employers will meet the situation with superlatively good management—a management that will welcome the worker to a share in control, and will increase production and wages without financial loss. Some employers will make decreased profits, some will go to the wall, and some will fight the new conditions. If wisdom prevails on both sides, a new constitution of industry will be achieved.

AUDITING WAGES AND PROFITS

The whole wage question will become increasingly a matter for expert accountants. This will mean a joint audit of costs, presented by management and men, and determined by the state. In the South Wales coal-field the figures as presented by the federation executive, after the cost of standard labor and stores and other costs of production have been deducted, show:

APPENDIX

<i>Period</i>	<i>Wages</i>	<i>Profits</i>
From April, 1910, to June, 1915.....	67.00 (per cent.).....	9.67
" July, 1915, to June, 1916.....	61.79 " "	16.35
Quarter ended June 30, 1916.....	56.46 " "	24.05

The owners reply that the rise in the cost of production has kept even with the rise in selling price. They instance the prices of pit wood, rails, and colliery stores, in addition to a succession of wage increases.

Obviously this is not a question for frenzied rhetoric, but for expert analysis. One wonders if, as we approach the minimum wage in legislation, we are approaching the maximum return permitted to capital. To make this clear: will the state lay down a minimum wage of thirty-six shillings for the worker, and a prohibition for capital of anything over ten per cent.?

THE TIE VOTE

The present proposals for workers' control through workshop councils leave the final vote on a tie with the management. The workers, sitting as council members with the managers of the industry, will become partners instead of wage hands in the business. They will be "junior partners" at first. The extent of their control will be determined by their ability and their self-conscious power as a class.

HOUSING

In the city of Stanley, England, "overcrowding is found to exist in 50 per cent. of the houses. It can hardly be doubted that the existence of overcrowding on so serious a scale is one of the chief factors which gives rise to such a high infantile mortality as is found in Stanley, namely 169 per one thousand births." So says the authoritative

APPENDIX

investigation "Livelhood and Poverty—A Study of Working Class Households in Northampton, Warrington, Stanley and Reading" (1915).

And it goes on to report:

One-half of the households below the poverty line at Warrington and Reading, nearly one-half at York, and one-third at Northampton, were living in poverty because the wages of the head of the household were so low that he could not support a family of three children or less. A great part of the poverty revealed by our inquiries is not intermittent but permanent, not accidental or due to exceptional misfortune, but a regular feature of the industries of the towns concerned. Of all the causes of primary poverty which have been brought to our notice, low wages are by far the most important. To raise the wages of the worst paid workers is the most pressing social task with which the country is confronted to-day.

In Northampton nearly 13 per cent. and in Reading 15 per cent. earn less than 20 shillings. In four out of five of the towns, more than one quarter, and in two out of five towns, more than one-third of the adult male workers were earning less than 24 shillings per week.

Sixty years ago, the population of England and Wales was evenly divided between town and country dwellers. Now four out of every five persons are living in the towns, and only one out of five in the country. Turning to rural conditions, as described in the investigation "How the Laborer Lives," we find:

Seventy per cent. of the agricultural workers in England and Wales are paid laborers, having no direct financial interest in the success or otherwise of the work in which they are engaged, and only 30 per cent. farmers, small holders, or members of their families. This is a serious fact, for probably in no other European country is there so high a proportion of agricultural workers who are "divorced from the soil." In 1907 the weekly earnings of ordinary agricultural laborers in England averaged 17 shillings

APPENDIX

6 pence. It may be taken as an established fact that a family of five persons whose total income does not exceed 20 shillings 6 pence, and whose rent is two shillings, is living below the "poverty line." If we now turn to the actual wages of ordinary agricultural laborers we find that with five exceptions, the average earnings in every county of England and Wales are below it. The real wages of agricultural laborers have actually diminished since 1900.

Let the reader try for a moment to realize what this means. It means that from the point of view of judicious expenditure, the be all and end all of life should be physical efficiency. It means that people have no right to keep in touch with the great world outside the village by so much as taking in a weekly newspaper. It means that a wise mother, when she is tempted to buy her children a pennyworth of cheap oranges, will devote the penny to flour instead. It means that the temptation to take the shortest railway journey should be strongly resisted. It seems that toys and dolls and picture books, even of the cheapest quality, should never be purchased; that birthdays should be practically indistinguishable from other days. It means that every natural longing for pleasure or variety should be ignored or set aside. It means, in short, a life without color, space, or atmosphere, that stifles and hems in the laborer's soul as in too many cases his cottage does his body.

The motto of one of the villagers is given: "We don't live, we linger." And yet, with these appalling conditions of primary poverty in city and country, it is true that "there has been an enormous improvement in the conditions of the industrial population in Britain during the last sixty or seventy years. There is a residuum of the population living on the margin of subsistence, whose lot could not have been much worse in 1830 than it is now. It is possible that the size of this residuum is as large, or even larger, now than seventy years ago, but it bears a smaller proportion to the total population."

APPENDIX

LIGHT RAILWAYS

Belgium has 22.8 miles of light railway to every 100 square miles of territory. Great Britain has .37 of 1 mile to every 100 square miles. That is, Belgium has 38 and one-half times as many miles of light railway in proportion to her total area as Great Britain. This means not only more agriculturists, but it means that more industrial workers can and do live on the land, instead of in the slums of cities. Twenty-three per cent. of the occupied persons in Belgium are engaged in agriculture, but 56 per cent. of the whole population live in rural and only 44 per cent. in urban communes. "Everywhere in traveling through Belgium one hears of tracts of land opened up to profitable agriculture or commerce by means of the light railways." The extraordinary development of agriculture is to no small extent due to these facilities for the transport of produce in bulk and in small quantities. A thorough study of this system of light railways has been made by Seebohm Rown-tree in "Land and Labor—Lessons from Belgium." He summarizes a detailed consideration as follows:

In comparison with her size, Belgium has the most extensive system of main and light railways and canals in the world. Almost all her main railways are national property, and she is financing her light railways so cleverly that they will become public property at the end of a certain number of years, without any appreciable cost to the public purse. She has frankly recognized that light railways cannot do more than just pay their way, and will never show so high a return upon capital as to induce capitalists to choose them in preference to other industrial investments. If economically managed, however, they can be run practically without loss, and they are of inestimable value in opening up country districts and developing agriculture. Indeed, it may be said that small holdings cannot be made fully successful without

APPENDIX

such means of cheap and rapid transport as light railways afford. Canals, which are almost all national property in Belgium, are looked upon as high roads, and the State is satisfied if the very low charges made for their use cover, or almost cover, the cost of upkeep. The very low rates charged for the transport of goods both on railways and canals are a great benefit to industry as well as agriculture, and the extraordinary cheapness of the workmen's tickets upon the railways has economic effects of a far-reaching character—among others it facilitates decentralization of population and industries, and thus largely destroys the monopoly of landowners in towns.

CHURCH ATTENDANCE

In the midweek of November, 1916, this advertisement appeared in the "Guardian":

The LIVING of Catherston Leweston, near Charmouth, Dorset, is VACANT. The adult inhabitants of the parish are 22, the full value of the living £75; value last year £67 17s. Healthy, southern locality, near the sea. No rectory-house.

A few years ago, the "Daily News" made a census of London churches. At that time the number of City Churches connected with the Established Church was 45. The attendances at all these churches on Sunday morning was 4,634. At St. Alban's, there were 13 persons present, of whom six were children. St. Mildred's had 14. In the morning, St. Alphege had 37, of whom 21 were children. In the evening, 37 came, but one child was unable to come, and an additional woman attended, and saved the average. Of the total 45 churches, eight had attendances of over 100 in the morning.

In one Nonconformist Congregational Church, the City Temple, there were 3,463 persons in the congregation, as compared to 4,634 persons in all the 45 churches of the Established Church. It is doubtful if the community will permanently carry that burden of expense for a venerable state institution.

APPENDIX

MONEY OR EDUCATION

The labor exchanges are constantly thrown against human problems. One of their executives told me of being forced to decide whether to send a lad fourteen years old, in poverty, into a fairly well-paid job, which will prove after a couple of years only a "blind alley," or to put him into a trade which will give him a low wage, but train him for a life-job. It is easy to decide on a "general principle," but what is the answer when one studies the living conditions of the boy and his family?

WOMEN IN INDUSTRY

Women in industry have opened many questions. Are they, for instance, willing to undergo a long industrial training from which they will be graduated skilled workers? One investigator states that in dressmaking materials they are ignorant of texture and fabric, "though these would seem to form a subject matter peculiarly fitted to their tastes. It is men who occupy the higher positions in this department because they have cared to fit themselves by a course of study."

Miss Proud in her book on "Welfare Work" reports:

There is a tendency for women to feed the machines which men control; that is to say, women's work is apt to become mechanical and low-priced, therefore uninspiring and inefficient. . . . Women are inferiors in the industrial world because they have not decided (except individually) that they desire to be otherwise, or at least that they desire to pay in training the price of efficiency.

If they remain untrained, they remain unskilled, and can not receive the wages of skilled labor. Are they to form a great new proletarian mass of unskilled labor, with low

APPENDIX

wages, while men workers direct them and receive a higher wage? Will such a division, growing ever sharper, answer the woman's craving for equality, which is one of the main impulses of the woman's movement? Will a system of wage slavery, with men eternally in the position of boss, foreman, and superintendent, seem a fuller life than the home?

Factory inspectors and employers state that the girl up to the age of twenty-five often has her mind only half on her work and the other half on her prospects of marriage. The evening is to her the most valuable part of the day, because she then becomes a social being. In a large and exceptionally healthful factory the women left at about twenty-five years of age.

"Their evenings," said the manager, "have ceased to be matters of first-rate importance to them, and they do not mind entering domestic service."

Miss Proud summarizes this sort of report, of which there were many:

The suggestion is that women, as a rule, do not give themselves unreservedly to their work until they no longer anticipate giving themselves in their offspring.

Psychological facts like these leave us with few of the old-time catch phrases such as "Equal pay for equal work."

WOMEN AND POPULATION

Adelyne More in her excellent pamphlet "Fecundity versus Civilization" has collected extracts from a wide reading of recent discussions on Birth Control. She quotes from Frau Stritt, president of the Woman Suffrage Union of Germany, who occupies a position in the German suffrage movement similar to that held by Mrs. Fawcett in England. Frau Stritt writes:

APPENDIX

This question (the responsibility of women for their lives as mothers) involves for all those who have learned to think things to their conclusion the real *innermost core of the woman question*. Thus in a certain sense the population question is to be regarded as *the woman question*,

and Frau Stritt quotes from Dr. Rutgers:

Through physiological knowledge the woman has again come to be the mistress of her own body and of her own fate.

I am seeking to record tendencies, not to offer special pleas for theories in this profoundly important matter of population, the solution of which will determine economic basis, social structure, and foreign policy. It is probably the most significant single step the race has ever taken in the control of environment. And it will be with this as with other extensions of that control. It will alter human relationships. Children—"that is the indispensable condition both for military and industrial success," says Nau-mann: food for powder and food for factories. The fact that such advocacy still exists must be faced by those who would blithely cut down the number of the western democracies.

Adelyne More sees the two problems.

(1) Birth-control must be practised in the slum. Until the lower class restricts, our civilization is being replenished by the feeble-minded and the diseased.

(2) The militaristic nations must practise birth-control or they will over-run the democracies.

She quotes from Alfred Naquet:

If the individuals who compose the nation wish to progress, to develop, to live; if, in order to attain this truly human ideal, they depart from the instinctive habits of the non-human animal; if they limit their offspring in order to raise themselves in dignity, in wealth, in intellectual power; to overcome the perils in which

APPENDIX

organic nature abounds, and to investigate the secrets of nature—then their country will be vanquished, invaded, spoiled of its wealth, and their children ruined and reduced to partial slavery.

Sir John Halliday Croom, Professor of Midwifery in the University of Edinburgh, writes:

The falling birth-rate is due to many complex causes, but a great many of the voluntarily sterile marriages are due to the fear and dread which women have of child-bearing. This, so far as my personal experience is concerned, is a growing dread, and I feel sure is one of the many causes giving rise to the falling birth-rate. Now, if a knowledge of Twilight Sleep were to become generally known amongst women, it would do a great deal to abrogate the first curse, and so relieve their minds of an overpowering dread.

Sidney Webb wrote, a few years ago:

Twenty-five per cent. of our parents is producing 50 per cent. of the next generation. . . . The ultimate future of these islands may be to the Chinese!

This year Dean Inge notes the tendency towards what I may call industrial celibacy, which he summarizes:

In all trades where the women work for wages the birth-rate has fallen sharply.

This restriction would tend to separate women into classes, of which we have an instance in the Athenian City-State, where there was a class of sterile intellectual alien women, in sharp distinction to the mothers of the race. We read in "The Greek Commonwealth":

Women tended to become crystallized into two separate types—the household matron under the tutelage of a husband or some other male protector, and the independent professional woman, who had indeed her "guardian" as Athenian law demanded, but kept him for occasional use, as we keep our solicitors.

APPENDIX

These professional women were wool-workers and market-women or retailers.

But the chief and most conspicuous profession open to an alien-born woman in a Greek city was to be what was known as a "companion." It was "companions," not marriageable girls, whom the young Athenian encountered in mixed gatherings, in attendance, perhaps, on some of the most refined and distinguished men of the day; for it was by contributing to the success of these parties, from which the native-born woman was rigidly excluded, that they earned their livelihood. "We have companions for the sake of pleasure," says Demosthenes, making a clear distinction in which there is no hint of overlapping, "and wives to bear us lawful offspring and be faithful guardians of our houses."

Though Athens had no Shakespeare to help us to understand them they must often have felt as lonely and as sad at heart as the poor Fool. If they had been allowed the support of their secluded sisters who could only watch them wistfully from their windows, as they mingled with the men in the streets and in the market-place, they might have set the intercourse of the sexes, for the first time in history, on an intelligent basis, and saved the memory of Athens from a reproach of which it is not possible to clear her.

The suggestion of a woman's sex strike is dealt with by Aristophanes in his *Lysistrata*. "Athens witnessed the rise of a movement for the emancipation of woman." Euripides expressed the "war-cry" of suffering woman, and their revolt from the "hard hating voices." But their bitterness did not avail, because organizing social thought had not arrived at the solution. To-day the effort is renewed to give expression to the various and complex dispositions of millions of individual women. War and the strife of labor and capital are surface ripples compared with the immense instinctive forces let loose by this effort. Governments and trade-unions will be broken if they oppose it.

APPENDIX

CLOTHES

At the meeting of shareholders of the Fore Street Warehouse Company a net profit for the year 1916 of \$315,000 was announced. In 1914 the profit was \$140,000. The chairman, in explaining the prosperity of this wholesale drapery company, said that "there were many women who for one reason or another had now more money to spend on surplus requirements than they had had at any previous time, and whose first and natural desire was to replenish their wardrobes."

The fact that drapery houses generally experienced a profitable year in 1916 is shown by the reports of the firms. Messrs. J. F. & H. Roberts, a Manchester house, record a net profit of £42,220 or £24,000 more than three years previously. Messrs. Hunter, Barr & Co. of Glasgow announce an improvement of fifty per cent. on 1913, the net profit for last year being £32,488. In the case of Messrs. John Howell & Co. the figure for last year was £42,158 against £10,580 in 1913. This is the highest result in the forty-six years' history of this company, and is nine times better than four years ago. Messrs. Pawsons & Leaf record an advance from £7,639 to £35,853 in the three years. Messrs. Foster, Porter & Co. of Wood Street also announce profits nearly three-and-a-half times those for the last year of peace, though in this case additional capital has been called up during the interval. The profit for 1916 was £49,188. Messrs. Alliston & Co. have turned a loss of £6,406 in 1913 into a profit of £11,156 last year.

Balancing this increased expenditure, we have many thousands of cases, of which Mrs. Pember Reeves has collected examples such as the following:

APPENDIX

Mrs. P. whose husband is a railway man, used to get 27 shillings before the war, and now has 33 shillings. She has a new baby, which brings the number of her children up to five. Her rent for three rooms was 7 shillings; it is now 8 shillings for four rooms. She always paid a shilling a week each to a clothing and a boot club, and this she continues to do. Her "gramophone" ("the women are all buying a piano or gramophone") appears to be that she now buys twelves loaves a week instead of seven, and pays four shillings instead of 1 shilling $5\frac{1}{2}$ pence for it. Her coal costs her $10\frac{1}{2}$ pence more, her meat 2 shillings more, her tea 5 pence, her potatoes 6 pence, and the rest of her expenditure is about 1 shilling 10 pence higher than it was before the war. She is getting six shillings more, but the items just quoted show that on them alone she is spending over eight shillings more than she used to do. She, therefore, has ceased to buy fish, bacon, eggs, cocoa, jam, and cow's milk altogether, and buys less quantities of pot-herbs, margarine, and sugar.

TRADE UNIONS AND VOTES FOR WOMEN

If the recommendations of the Speaker's Franchise Conference are carried into effect, the male electorate will number nearly 11 million out of a manhood of $12\frac{1}{2}$ million. But the Speaker's Conference has dodged the woman suffrage question, and, instead of a unanimous finding, they have passed on the onus of giving women the vote to Parliament. They have given only a majority vote to the "principle, and present a "proposal" which will give the suffrage to six million women out of 14 million. In short, they have "side-stepped," and left "Lloyd George's munition girls" who "saved the nation" to win the vote if they can. The Woman's Movement in Great Britain will continue to be in part political, not because it does not value the human implications of woman's position in the modern world, but because it believes the franchise is necessary in order to achieve those higher values. The insistence on "Votes for Women" has wrongly seemed to some continen-

APPENDIX

tal critics as the superficial catch-phrase of women who had not plumbed the meaning of feminism.

Industrially, working women face the same situation as politically. The fight for a decent standard of living is only in its beginning. There are only 74,000 factories and workshops out of 277,000 in the United Kingdom under regulations or Special Rules. At Barking, a firm, engaged in the manufacture of India rubber goods, was employing 600 women. Soon after the outbreak of war, the firm announced that workers in the Warping shed would be employed if they signed this agreement: "We, the undersigned, agree to work without a Trade Union." The manager said: "I will have no woman in the firm who belongs to a Trade Union." Eighty of the women belonging to the Warping Department refused to sign the paper. The majority of them found work elsewhere.

Certain trade unions have opened their membership to women—the Dockers' Union in the Transport Workers' Federation, some of the unions in the Federation of Furnishing Trades, the National Union of Railwaymen, and the Railway Clerks' Association. But the engineering trade—where the largest movement of women into men's work has taken place—has not made up its mind, and has improvised a Speaker's Conference compromise in which women are enrolled in the National Federation of Women Workers, by arrangement with the Amalgamated Society of Engineers. About 40,000 women have been so organized out of 500,000 women munition makers. The working woman's place is either the sweat shop or trade-union. As J. J. Mallon, who has long mediated in wage and status disputes, says:

The line of separation between skilled and unskilled workmen is shown by the war to rest on little more than a convention, and

APPENDIX

the craftsmen realize that if the laborer is not admitted to comradeship all their privileges are insecure.

And that line of separation is equally a convention between men and women.

"The Woman Worker," the organ of the woman's trade union movement, states:

The women who are doing very well are those who have had the help, not merely of their own organizations, but of the great men's unions. The Government protection of wages has been given, not in proportion to the needs of the workers, or to their usefulness, but solely in proportion to the strength of the demand.

And it instances Newcastle, where there are 6,000 women trade-union members, and the award given in the case of Messrs. Armstrong Whitworth's is superior to others, the time rate being fixed at 5 pence an hour, with special rates for gagers, examiners, and danger zone workers.

So, in the next five years, women must win over Government, the men's trade unions, and the employers.

IRISH RAILWAYS

Irish railways were investigated a few years ago by the British Government. Their commissioners found that the Irish railway problem is the restriction of agriculture, industry and trade in Ireland, because internal and export transit rates are on a higher scale than the rates charged for conveyance of commodities which compete with Irish products in Irish and British markets. The decadence of Irish industries has been accelerated by the establishment of low through rates from British manufacturers to Irish villages, rates which have been much lower in scale than the local rates from Irish cities to Irish villages. The British-controlled Irish railways favored the British man-

APPENDIX

facturer at the expense of the local Irish manufacturer. The woolen trade and the textile and pottery industries have withered.

But not only have through import rates into Ireland for many years been relatively lower than the Irish internal rates, but also through rates from abroad to British ports and interior centers have been on a lower scale than the export rates from Ireland. As the result of this, not only has Irish commercial industry been strangled, but Irish agriculture has been crippled. Even Ireland's one best agricultural industry, livestock, expanded only about 16 per cent. in twenty years, and the cattle trade employs comparatively little labor. In eggs, Russia has been competing successfully against Ireland. On November 14, 1916, T. W. Russell, vice-president of the Department of Agriculture, stated publicly that by far the largest proportion of the damage done in transit to exported eggs took place after the eggs had left Ireland.

Winter dairying would be stimulated by proper railway facilities. If coals came to Newcastle from Cologne there would be prompt action. But Danish butter came into Limerick, one of the principal centers of the Irish butter trade. Irish butter is not to be had throughout the year in quantity enough for home consumption, though climate and agricultural conditions of Ireland are more favorable for winter dairying than those of Denmark. Better methods of production and a reduction of railway rates, encouraging farmers to go in for winter dairying, are both needed.

The classification of Irish goods, each with its own rate, is confusing. The secretary of the Coöperative Movement stated to the Railway Commission that "the influence exercised over Irish railways by English companies is a bad influence, a growing influence, and likely to grow further."

APPENDIX

The Managing Director of the City of Dublin Steam Packet Company asserted that the London and North Western Railway Company practically controls the Irish railways, and that a company like his own, when competing with that railway company across the Channel, is virtually powerless, as whatever rates it agrees to, his company has to agree to the same.

Just as Ireland has been importing food when she could produce it, so she has been making large imports in coal when she has extensive coal fields. Here, as in agriculture, railway facilities are needed. The required additional capital for opening certain of them up will be forthcoming when the requisite railway communication is provided. This is true of the Castlecomer and the Arigna coal fields. Four miles of railway will release the Arigna mines.

Of the field at Coalisland, E. St. John Lyburn, economic geologist and mineral expert to the Department, said:

The prospector would require \$25,000 or \$50,000 for trial holes, and the field can be developed for \$1,500,000 or \$2,000,000. There is no other country but this where the trial would not have been made before now. There are about 60 million tons of coal, and that can be multiplied by ten or one hundred, as the deposits are revealed by the scaling of the trial holes.

In this one instance, it is capital rather than railway facilities that are required. But at Wolf Hill, and for most of Ireland, the primary need is railway facility. Capital will follow opportunity. The condition of low rates and special facilities in railway transport is a traffic large in volume, regular in transmission, and presented to the carriers in a form convenient to handle. This means regularity of supply, a volume of consignments, good packing of produce, coöperation among producers. The low Continental rates, which have helped to capture the British

APPENDIX

markets, and injure Ireland, are also due in many instances to the cheapening of transport by Government subsidy and to state ownership of lines.

While I was in Ireland, the Irish railways were taken over by the British Government. No policy has yet been announced. A broad state policy in tillage, fertilizer, seeds, machinery and a unified and extended railway system will bring prosperity to Ireland. If that Government subsidy carries with it the power over Irish taxation, the Irish people will probably reject the policy. In that event, Ireland herself will have to find the money for raising her major industry, agriculture, to a new level. In either case, the time has come for a momentous decision, on which rests the welfare of the next fifty years.

IRISH AGRICULTURE

A country, whose basic industry is agriculture, has to import its food. A country, made up of farmers and under-populated, has too few farms, and those farms too small and poor. Such is the heritage left to Ireland by "British statesmanship" like that of Sir Robert Peel. The economic basis of Ireland is agriculture, but in 1915 it was forced to import bacon and hams at a cost of \$15,500,000, butter \$2,800,000, oats \$750,000, wheat \$20,000,000, wheat flour \$18,500,000.

T. W. Russell, vice-president of the Department of Agriculture, says:

Without doubt we might have produced every shilling's worth of this and much more ourselves. The Government at the present time is bringing food from every quarter of the globe. It is doing this at immense cost and at no little risk. And all the while there are several millions of acres in Ireland which might be tilled with profit to the farmer and immense advantage to the State.

APPENDIX

The Department of Agriculture states that there is every likelihood that next season the supply of superphosphate will not equal the demand. This will prevent the manuring of grass lands. Some thousands of tons of sulphate of copper was exported, not for military purposes. "It was taken from Irish agriculture," says the "Freeman's Journal," "at a time of its sorest need and sold to protect agriculture in other countries. Hence there was only a limited supply of spraying material in this country to stem the ravages of the blight."

It was sold to France and Italy for spraying grapes.

This action left Irish agriculturalists with practically no sulphate for the spraying of potatoes. That is the cause of the failure of more than one-fourth of the Irish potato crop this year.

Mr. Runciman, speaking of the United Kingdom, said:

Plowing is behindhand not only because many horses have been put out of action, but because steam carriage is lying idle in consequence of mechanics having been so freely recruited from some of the big agricultural implement makers.

Irish agriculture has been crippled at the very crisis when food is necessary for Great Britain to win the war. Supplies of seed, fertilizer, imported food-stuffs, and agricultural and dairy machinery, are shortened when they ought to be greatly extended.

An important study of Irish agriculture has recently been made by an expert whom I know, who signs himself "Agricola." I am not at liberty to publish his name. One of the high officials of the British Government in Ireland recommended these articles to me as giving a just picture of conditions. I summarize the conclusions in what follows.

Irish agriculture is backward because three-fifths of the

APPENDIX

land is held by one-sixth of the landholders under terms restricting or prohibiting tillage. Four-fifths of all the crops are used on the farms for seed or for food to live stock, and only one-fifth is sold either as human food, as food for non-agricultural live stock, or as raw material for industry, such as flax and barley. From that one-fifth must also be deducted the one-seventh which farmers and their families use. So farming product is one-seventh crops and six-sevenths live stock and produce for live stock. There is room then for extension of the crop area of Ireland, which would both benefit the live stock production and increase corn food for the population. Care must be taken in increasing tillage not to let cows run dry for want of sufficient food. But care can be taken to safeguard live stock and yet to release the acreage of Ireland for tillage.

Over sixty-four per cent. of the land of Ireland is in grass or crops.

At every stage in his history the Irish agriculturalist has been struggling against laws and ordinances that sought to force grazing instead of tillage. These Orders and enactments are on record since the days of Cromwell and the Stuarts.

But the tillage instinct of the Irish farmer has continued strong against alien legislation.

In the middle of the last century, Peel attacked tillage in Ireland, and the wholesale evictions that cleared thousands of acres were the beginning of the grazing ranches that are the cause of contention in our own day.

Four hundred and sixty-seven thousand three hundred and thirty-five acres of wheat were lost to the plow.

The British Food Controller would do well to note that the loss of this food in this crisis in his country's history is due to what was then loudly acclaimed as "wise British statesmanship." The decrease in the area of all corn crops since Sir Robert Peel's

APPENDIX

Plantation Scheme was started is nearly two million acres. There is a loss of 60 per cent. of corn, of 26 per cent. of green crops, and of 65 per cent. of flax.

In 1916, the area of pasture and grazed mountain increased by 86,585 acres to total of 12,437,709 acres. The tillage increased only 42,236 acres to a total of 2,400,356 acres. So the same bad tendency toward pasture over tillage is still under way. England in refusing to let Ireland sow has now failed to reap the harvests that would have reduced submarines to toys.

The absence of drainage and of irrigation is a further hindrance to Irish farming. The lowering of riverbeds, like the Barrow and the Shannon, is suggested. A century ago, a Royal Commission of the British Government recommended a drainage scheme for the 477,784 acres of turf bog in Ireland. Other commissions since then have reinforced the demand, but the bogs still exist and even in recent years have risen on their underwater and traveled over the adjacent country, in one instance for a distance of ten miles and a depth of 40 feet. A bog injures the land around by excessive moisture to an extent of perhaps 50 per cent. of its own area. The bogs of Ireland cover 4 and one-third per cent. of the surface of the land. Eight and one-half per cent. of Connacht is bog, and nineteen per cent. of King's County. There is bog in every Irish county. If these bogs were drained, much land would be freed, irrigation would be possible, and the immense supplies of peat could be used locally, converted into charcoal, for the production of power.

TRUSTS

Lord Milner writes:

The future belongs to big-scale business or to such smaller

APPENDIX

businesses as can learn to work together and to pool their resources for certain objects—the full use of scientific research being only one of them—which individually they are not strong enough to attain.

But large-scale production alone does not solve the labor difficulty. Our mining combines in the West and Pennsylvania, our steel combine in the East, our interstate-railway combines have not softened the labor conflict. Two points of view are common in discussing big combines. One is to fight them as tyrannical and to try to break them up into competing units; the other is to swallow them whole. Neither satisfies. Is the large unit necessarily the most efficient? Is there no limit to its size? If in the given case, it is the most efficient, what shall be the method of democratic control? These are questions more fertile than ethical questions of the "good trusts," and theoretical questions as to whether Mr. Rockefeller is the middleman between individualism and socialism. A powerful group of men are urging the syndication of industry in England. They approve of "the large scale" for business. Doubtless, they will be successful. But when they have achieved it, they will be faced by the same problems that America now wrestles with.

THE DECAY OF PARLIAMENT

Sidney Low in "The Fortnightly Review" says that Parliament has ceased to be a government-making organ, and that government in the future will continue to be carried on by great administrative commissions appointed by the cabinet, directly responsible to it, and removed from the direct control of Parliament.

The democratic machinery of the nineteenth century has broken down. A new machinery is being slowly con-

APPENDIX

structed. Under the old régime elected representatives of the people became the law-making body, the legislature; and a committee of the legislature was selected to be the cabinet, or executive. But in recent years there has grown up a body of a thousand departmental administrators, outside Parliament, housed in government departments. This bureaucracy is a set of permanent expert officials who not only actually administer the law as created by Parliament, but initiate new legislation, which is carried into effect over the head of Parliament, because it is drafted into bills by these experts, handed to the cabinet by them, and made into acts by the power of the cabinet exercised on Parliament. So Parliament has tended to become a ratifying voice instead of a law-making body.

The cabinet, also, has changed. The various departmental heads, who used to sit around as "cabinet ministers" and confer, have been forced back into their function as administrators of departments. A small body of men, just now five in number, form the directorate of government. The change from twenty-three executives to five gives centralization of power and exactly located responsibility. The few can get results, and they can be held to account, where the many dodged both action and "strict accountability." The change is similar to that which has taken place in several hundred American city governments. Under the old ward system, we used to elect twenty or thirty men to "run" a city. Now we elect a commission government of five men, with full power and responsibility, who select their departmental administrative staffs.

The five who rule Great Britain are called the War Council. When peace comes, it is probable that the old extended cabinet will temporarily revive and resume its activities as a debating society, with diffused, unlocated re-

APPENDIX

sponsibility and weakened executive power. But that machinery is outworn and is sure to be scrapped. It was constructed on the theory that the state is made up of citizens who can conduct their corporate life through representatives. That theory is an over-simplification of government.

To sum up present tendencies, the executive is rapidly defining itself and constructing its machinery. It is tending toward the organized states directed by a few powerful executives, surrounded by administrative departments. It has outpaced the legislature, which is drifting impotent on the tide of state socialism, devised by expert officials and enacted by the handful of five men in control of government. This new legislation was demanded by the community not through its Parliamentary representatives, but by the new channels of trade-unions and government departments (military, naval, munitions, board of trade, home office, and local government board).

But not only has the legislature been outpaced. Democratic control over these executives and experts has failed to keep step with the rapid growth in their power. The community has not yet devised checks upon them. Representatives in Parliament, elected from geographical localities, are now seen to be only one of the needed effective controls. The citizen is not only and essentially a resident in an area called Battersea who elects a Battersea man to safeguard Battersea interests. The citizen is also a producer and a consumer, and he wishes those functions safeguarded in government. The citizen as consumer is gradually establishing coöperation and local and national ownership. As a producer he strengthens whatever trade-union he belongs to (whether as doctor, business man, barrister, teacher, railwayman, or locomotive engineer) and is slowly,

APPENDIX

but increasingly, establishing local, district, and national parliaments in his profession and industry. Through workshop council, joint district board, and national conciliation committees he is asserting a control on government. Already it is unquestioned that the demands of such a union as the miners are more effective in creating new legislation than the demands of members of Parliament. To coördinate these parallel and conflicting claims will be the coming task of government. The result will be a remodeled British Constitution. The present total eclipse of Parliament is more complete than it will be after the war. Some of Parliament's former power will return to it. A resultant will be established between the various pressures of producers and consumers, between syndicalism and coöperation and state and municipal socialism.

TARIFF REFORM

The effort will soon be made in Great Britain to thrust into the forefront of politics minor fractional parts of reconstruction as if they were major. A valuable pamphlet called "The Elements of Reconstruction" says:

There is a danger—and nowadays it is the great danger—of becoming just as blindly superstitious about a tariff (as about the kindred superstition of Free Trade). A tariff is perhaps a necessary part of any national economic scheme, but it is not in itself an economic scheme. A tariff varies in public value with the economic constitution of the State it protects. The country will not stand a merely protective tariff in foodstuffs, or in any commodity.

CHILD WELFARE

Sir George Newman, chief medical officer of the board of education, states:

The machinery for dealing with the welfare of infants and of children of school age is in existence, although all that ought to

APPENDIX

be got from it is not yet being obtained. But the machinery for dealing with children between one year and five years of age has yet to be built.

BACKWARD RACES

The whole question of undeveloped countries and backward races has never been thought through by our people. We are lazy-minded on the causes of the war, and cherish a vague pacifism, as if the instinct of nationality and the lust for territory and new markets were non-existent.

A. E. Zimmern writes:

It may still be argued that the question is not Have the civilized powers annexed large empires? but Ought they to have done so? Was such an extension of governmental authority justifiable or inevitable? Englishmen in the nineteenth century, like Americans in the twentieth, were slow to admit that it was; just as the exponents of laissez-faire were slow to admit the necessity for State interference with private industry at home. But in both cases they have been driven to accept it by the inexorable logic of facts. What other solution of the problem, indeed, is possible?

He then quotes another authority on the impossibility of standing aside and letting adventurers and exploiters enter, and on the need of backward peoples having contact with the outside world, and receiving protection from oppression and corruption. This is a "duty" of the great powers—"a still better name would be the great responsibilities."

The late Lord Cromer, in defending his rule in Egypt, once said:

What, gentlemen, has there been no moral advancement? Is the country any longer governed, as was formerly the case, exclusively by the use of the whip? Is not forced labor a thing of the past? Has not the accursed institution of slavery practically ceased to exist? Is it not a fact that every individual in the country, from the highest to the lowest, is now equal in the eyes of the law; that thrift has been encouraged, and that the most

APPENDIX

humble member of society can reap the fruits of his own labor and industry; that justice is no longer bought and sold; that every one is free—perhaps some would think too free—to express his opinions; that King Backsheesh has been dethroned from high places and now only lingers in the purlieus and byways of the administration; that the fertilizing water of the Nile is distributed impartially to prince and peasant alike; that the sick man can be tended in a well-equipped hospital; that the criminal and the lunatic are no longer treated as wild beasts; that even the lot of the brute creation has not escaped the eyes of the reformer; that the solidarity of interests between the governors and the governed has been recognized in theory and in practice; that every act of the Administration, even if at times mistaken—for no one is infallible—bears the mark of honesty of purpose and an earnest desire to secure the well-being of the population; and further, that the funds, very much reduced in amount, which are now taken from the pockets of the taxpayers, instead of being, for the most part, spent on useless palaces and other objects, in which they were in no degree interested, are devoted to purposes which are of real benefit to the country? If all these, and many other, points to which I could allude, do not constitute some moral advancement, then, of a truth, I do not know what the word morality implies.

Let us criticize as much as we like the arrogance of tone in this and in the English belief in general that they are born to govern. But what do we offer in place of their imperfect administration? Are we willing to take on our share of the job of internationalizing these plague-spots, or are we going to turn them over to the people who live there? Which people? To the Mahdi and Khalifa who rise on a wave of religious hysteria and cause the death of over five million Egyptians in the space of fourteen years? To the particular tribe with the sharpest sword? To the most corrupt, and therefore most powerful, native prince who will use machine-guns on the “aliens” in the next province because they honor the prophet instead of the all-highest Lord Buddha? Is laissez-faire satisfactory? Ac-

APPENDIX

tually there are only three "futures" for the undeveloped countries: anarchy, with the slavery and murder of the gentler tribes, and the unbridled exploitation of most of the natives; colonial rule; internationalization.

HORATIO BOTTOMLEY

The value of Horatio Bottomley as a leader in time of crisis can be appraised by these extracts from "John Bull." This is his contribution to child welfare:

EDUCATION

Will the new Education Minister just try to shake off his University prejudices, and bring in a short Act releasing from school attendance all children capable of assisting on farms or doing other useful work—for the duration of the war? Never mind when William the Conqueror came to the throne.

This is his knightly militant note:

To win through to victory we must make every German bite the dust. The women who danced in the streets when the *Lusitania* murderers shocked civilization are fighting us just as much as the men who reeled with drink when the joy bells rang over little children done to death by the bombs of the Zeppelin.

One of his contributors has a word for backward races:

Why drain Great Britain dry of its manhood, until the colored sons of Empire have been called into the fighting lines to help to bear the burden of war? We want more men to bring the Hun to his knees—why not three, six, or ten million colored soldiers to help to ram the sword of Victory home? I know many of the colored races, and I believe they would fight willingly and splendidly. Some opponents allege otherwise; if the latter are right, why ask the British taxpayers in time of peace to shell out to keep and protect a population that is no good to us in time of adversity?

Finally we have Bottomley, the man of faith and vision, facing the unseen, a gentleman unafraid:

APPENDIX

I, the man of the world, the man of Business, the man of affairs, the disciple of Foote and Bradlaugh, the nephew of George Jacob Holyoake—I have come to be convinced that there is no such thing as Death.

LORD NORTHCLIFFE

If labor becomes the crowned king, Lord Northcliffe will be found the first by the throne. The most popular newspaper in Great Britain is his "Daily Mail." It is getting ready to make the flop. On January 25, 1917, it stated editorially:

LABOR AND THE NORTHCLIFFE PRESS

WHY WE ARE PLEASED

Far from believing that Labor has supplied too many Cabinet Ministers, we look forward quite confidently and cheerfully to the day when it will have many more, believing that after the success of our present Labor Ministers other Labor Ministers will be just as good. The responsibility of carrying on this Empire is great enough and inspiring enough to bring out the best qualities of any man of energy and insight who puts his back into the work. And if we are told with bated breath that a Labor Cabinet is a possibility of the future, then we reply without hesitation that we are quite ready for it. We are satisfied that whenever it does come, as, no doubt, it will in due course, it will be as good as any other Government we have ever had and it may be assured that in working for the welfare of our country and the Empire it will have the support of the Northcliffe Press.

THE WHITE KNIGHT

Here is a touch out of the eleventh century. A recent issue of "The Observer" stated that "if we are not mistaken," the line of the White Knight was now extinct. Philip John Fitz-Gibbon thereupon wrote to them in November of 1916:

APPENDIX

OBSERVER:

November 12, 1916.

I beg to observe that this is not the case. Though I have never assumed the title, I am the holder of it. . . . At the time of my father's death in February, 1881, my uncle published an obituary notice in "The Times" and other papers stating that my father, Maurice Fitz-Gibbon, was the White Knight and that I was his successor in the title.

In Vol. XVII, No. 93, of the Journal of the Cork Historical and Archaeological Society for January-March, 1912, Colonel J. Grove White, J. P., D.L., of Kilbyrne, Co. Cork, published the White Knight's pedigree (from Dominus Otho in A.D. 1057 to date), which was taken from the authorities he has therein quoted, and stated clearly that I hold the title of White Knight, being 24th in descent from the said Dominus Otho and 17th in descent from the first White Knight, Maurice, who was the eldest son of Gilbert, or Gibbon, whose second and third brothers, John and Maurice, were the respective ancestors of the Knights of Glinn (Black Knight) and Kerry (Red Knight). These Knighthoods date from the battle of Hallidon Hill in 1333.

The pedigree is taken largely from the Cotter MS., now in the British Museum. Burke's "Landed Gentry," too, states that I am the White Knight.

LOCAL PATRIOTISM

The English love of locality is often overlooked by foreign observers, because the Englishman seldom puts it into words. Thus Monsieur Davry says that the word *patrie* does not exist in English: for a Frenchman *patrie* means his sacred soil: home and inheritance. But "the place and all around it" are equally dear to the Englishman. Recently Lieutenant Lord Newborough died from trench-chill. In his will he wrote:

I wish to be buried, if I die in England, in the simplest manner compatible with decency, on the summit of the Bluff in Festiniog, which lies on the western side of the road from Bryn Llewellyn

APPENDIX

and which Bluff is known to my sisters and intimate friends as Newborough Hill, as from that spot there is my favorite view down the Vale of Festiniog; and I wish my tombstone to be a simple slab of stone from my estate, protected from desecration by tourists, but otherwise leaving my burial-place free for sheep and cattle to roam all around the actual grave.

THE BRITISH COMMONWEALTH

Archdall Reid has written in the "Eugenics Review" of the British Commonwealth. He says:

This conflict (the war), however huge, is no more than an episode in an immensely vaster struggle, of which the prize is not precarious political supremacy in Europe for a few generations, but world predominance irrevocably established by nature. True decision was reached nearly a century ago. The great immigrations and permanent conquests are drawing to a final close. Germany joins a contest already decided. The battle is over, and with us rests the ultimate victory. The Anglo-Saxons have more space for expansion than any other people. "All North America" is "in the grasp of the Anglo-Saxon and his race" has "almost limitless space for expansion." Subsequently he colonized Australasia. His place in the sun, his ultimate world-supremacy was now established. . . . With the exception of temperate South America and parts of the western seaboard of that continent, our race has colonized almost all the regions of the new world in which it is possible for a European race to flourish. In the coming future no other people will be so numerous, so widespread, or in command of resources so tremendous.

Canada and Australasia may follow the example of the United States, and separate politically from the parent stock. **BUT THE RACE ITSELF IS SECURE.** It is impossible, within the bounds of probability, to imagine a conjunction of circumstances capable of uprooting it from its new habitations. The sword and disease are the only agents of racial elimination known to us, and now the latter, like the former, is losing its power.

Dean Inge, who is one of the two or three best thinkers in the Established Church, has visioned the same future,

APPENDIX

and he sees the possibility of a white race of 200,000,000 in the British Commonwealth.

WHAT TO READ

A bibliography of the present reconstruction in Great Britain would number thousands of books and pamphlets. I wish to suggest a few of the more important of these for my reader who cares to make a study.

Graham Wallas's "Human Nature in Politics" and "The Great Society" are the products of a lifetime of constructive thinking by one of the fertile intellects of the modern world. No one who wishes to understand the deeper psychological elements in the problems of modern England can do without the help of Wallas. He is one of the few writers on human nature in national and international politics and industrial organization whose conclusions have been left unassailed by the war.

Bertrand Russell's "Principles of Social Reconstruction" (published in America as "Why Men Fight") is a stimulating instance of the new psychology applied to society. It contains passages of great beauty. Mr. Russell is not a fundamental thinker in social matters in the sense that Graham Wallas is. His book is a poem.

A. E. Zimmern's essays in the "Round Table" and in the volume "Progress and History" are a careful study of the industrial situation by a man who understands the present tendency toward workers' control.

"The Reorganization of Industry," a pamphlet issued by Ruskin College, contains a skilful analysis of what the post-office would be under democratic control.

W. Mellor, the secretary of the National Guilds League, has kindly drawn up for me a list of references on workers' control. The list includes "Labor in War Time" by

APPENDIX

G. D. H. Cole; the publications of the National Guilds League on "National Guilds," "The Guild Idea," "Towards a Miners' Guild"; "National Guilds," edited by A. R. Orage; "The World of Labor" by Cole; "The Coal Trade" by H. S. Jevons; "Experiments in Industrial Organization" by Cadbury; "Trade as a Science" by McBean; "Coöperative Production and Profit Sharing," an investigation by the committee of the Fabian Research Department.

The investigation by the section of economic science and statistics of the British Association for the Advancement of Science has been published under the title of "Labor, Finance and the War."

The pamphlet "Great Britain After the War" by Sidney Webb and Arnold Freeman is a short and valuable summary.

The Garton Foundation has issued a book on the "Industrial Situation after the War" which analyzes the revolutionary unrest and suggests remedies. Mr. Balfour is one of the trustees of this foundation.

The investigations of Seebohm Rowntree are already classics for social workers. His studies of York, of agricultural labor, of land, of Belgium, are widely known. It will be found that his recommendations will be influential in the reconstruction.

"The Times" has had four series of articles of high importance. One series has been republished in a pamphlet called "The Elements of Reconstruction," with an introduction by Viscount Milner. A second series was on the resources of the empire, written by Wilson Fox, and led to the formation of the Empire Resources Development Committee. A third was on the South Wales miners, and was instrumental in leading the Government to take over the mines. A fourth was on the industrial situation after the

APPENDIX

war, and is a powerful statement for workers' control. It is written by Sidney Webb, and is now republished in pamphlet form.

Miss Proud's book on "Women and Welfare Work," with an introduction by Lloyd-George, is a careful compilation of the improvements in the status of the British worker instituted by employers, the trade-unions, and the state. There is little interpretation in the book, but a valuable mass of facts.

There is unfortunately nothing comprehensive on the woman's movement in its present development. The reports of Miss Anderson to the home office and Mrs. Bernard Drake's "Women in Engineering" are valuable for the area they cover. Files of the "Woman Worker," the organ of the Women's Trade Union Movement, cover many specific instances. But the book of the movement remains to be written. What is needed in England to give coherence and self-consciousness to the woman's movement is as good a book as Katharine Anthony's "Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia."

An excellent English statement of the Irish situation is given in the "Round Table" for September, 1916. George Russell ("A. E.") handles economics with his own admirable rhythm in his volume, "The National Being: Some Thoughts on an Irish Polity." He is one of the three leaders in the Irish Coöperative Movement. No book exists to give us the full history of the coöperative movement in Ireland. It should be written.

For an understanding of the young men of Ireland today the files for recent months of such weeklies as the "New Ireland" and "Irish Opinion" are necessary. Nowhere else is there so bold and clear an expression of the idealism which is penetrating the younger elements of the nation.

APPENDIX

Such, then, are a few of the publications of comment on the vast changes now under way in the British nation. The opportunity is ripe for a book on the British commonwealth corresponding to Bryce's "American Commonwealth."

INDEX

A. E.: 180; solution of Anglo-Irish problem by, 198-205; quoted on tenant farmers in Ireland, 213, 214, 264. *See* George Russell.

"A Nation Once Again": patriotic Irish song, quoted, 192.

"A Study of Working Class Households in Northampton, Stanley and Reading": quoted on housing of workingmen, 384, 385.

Actresses' Franchise League, 103.

Adams, Mrs. Bridges, 355, 356.

Afforestation, 23.

Agricultural communities: past success of, 60 *et seq.*

Allen, Miss, 159.

"Amalgamated Society of Engineers Journal," 285, 286.

America: English emigration to, 31; wages of women in, 96; birth-control movement in, 116; attitude of, toward birth restriction, 124 *et seq.*; national thought in, 317-326. *See* United States.

Anglo-Indian: type of, 329, 330.

Anitchkin, Dimitri, 285.

Antin, Mary, 325.

Aristophanes: quoted on emancipation of woman, 393.

Arnold, Matthew, 211.

Art: attitude of modern democracy toward, 61 *et seq.*

Artists' League, 103.

Asquith, Mr., 36.

"Atheneum," 266.

Atkinson, Miss, 101.

Australia, 4, 9.

Bairnsfather, Captain Bruce: on the "Tommy" attitude toward trench fighting, 280, 281.

Bakunin, 283.

Balfour, Mr.: type of mind of, 8; quoted on democracy, 367, 381.

Beatty, 3.

Belgium: in relation to social problems, 69 *et seq.*; relief work for, 237, 238, 241.

Bell, Sir Hugh: analysis by, of wage problem, quotation, 48, 49, foot-note; on cost of production of steel, 382.

Belloc, Hilaire, 272.

Bibliography of reconstruction movement in Great Britain, 413-416.

Bigland, Alfred: quoted on empire resources, 363, 364.

Birth-control: problem of, 112 *et seq.*; movement in America, 116; English opinion on, 390-393.

Bishops: attitude of, toward workers, 30.

Black, Clementine, 101.

Blatchford, Robert, 248.

Bloomfield, 92.

INDEX

Bonar Law: "Tory" type of mind of, 8.

Bosanquet, Mrs., 101.

Bottomley, Horatio, editor "*John Bull*": 248, 267-269, 295; quoted on education, 410; attitude toward death, 410.

Bridges, Robert, 272.

Brisbane, Arthur, 268.

British Association: report of, cited on modern automatic machinery, 22, 59.

British Commonwealth: plan and purpose of new, 4 *et seq.*; influence of war on, 6 *et seq.*, 96, 252, 253; relation of south of England to, 292, 293; Lord Milner quoted on, 353; Archdale Reid on, 412, 413. *See* England, Ireland.

British Empire: unification of into one state, 7 *et seq.*.

"British Weekly," 272.

Bryce, Viscount: quoted on English war spirit, 229.

Burns, Robert, 93.

Butler, Geoffrey: quoted on class system, 27, 350.

Button, 62.

Cabinet: cause of changes in British, 7 *et seq.*; predictions as to shifts in, 9.

Cambridge: influence of, on class system, 28.

"Cambridge Magazine," 248.

Canada, 4.

Canning, 321.

Carels Frères, 380.

Carpenter, Edward, 63; quoted on English people, 183, 184, 314.

Carson, Sir Edward: 8; quoted on Ulster's attitude, 202, 262.

Cathery, E.: quoted on right of asylum, 285.

Catholic Women's League, 103.

"Chamber's," 274.

Chamberlain, Joseph, 378.

Chesterton, Cecil, 260, 261.

Chesterton, Gilbert K.: remark of, on writing books, 63; quoted on the democratic movement, 229, 258; effect of, on public opinion, 260-262; on the "Tommy" attitude toward war, 280.

Child labor, 144, 166 *et seq.*

Child welfare: Sir George Newmann quoted on, 407.

Childers, Erskine: cited on the new social order in Ireland, 177.

Children: withdrawal of, from industry, 144.

"Christian Commonwealth," British periodical, 272.

Church: "brotherhood of trenches" tried in, 366, 367.

Class system, 26 *et seq.*

Clergy: influence of Church of England on socialism, 29 *et seq.*

Clifford, Dr., 344.

Clothes: women's increased expenditure on, since entering industrial field, 393-395.

Cohan, George, 267.

Collet, Clara, 101.

Colonies: attitude of, toward present status, 4.

Combines. *See* Trusts.

Common people: awakening of, 13. *See also* Workmen.

"Common Sense," 274.

Commonwealth: genesis of the British, 4 *et seq.*; effect of war on, 6 *et seq.* *See* British Commonwealth.

INDEX

Companion help: wage and work-schedule of, in boarding house, 146.

Connolly, 188.

Constitutional reconstruction: effect of war on, 6 *et seq.*

"Contemporary Review," 273.

Coöperation: study of, in England, 368-380.

Coöperative communities: influence of, 82 *et seq.*

Coöperative socialism: tendency of England toward, 15 *et seq.*

Coöperative Society, 379.

Coöperative societies: in Ireland, 213 *et seq.*

"Cornhill Magazine," 274.

"Cotton Factory Times," 285.

Croatia, 96.

Cromer, Lord: 253, 329; quoted on moral advancement of Egypt under British rule, 408, 409.

Croom, Sir John Halliday: quoted on birth-control, 391, 392.

Cuba, 322.

Curtis, Lionel, 253, 269, 273.

Curzon, Lord: type of political mind of, 8, 14, 262, 329.

"Daily Mail" (London): 270, 295, 311; quoted on labor, 411.

"Daily News" (London): 271; census by, of church attendance, 388.

"Dallas News," 271.

Devenport, Lord, 311.

Davies, Mr., war secretary, 339.

Davis, Thomas: author of song "A Nation Once Again," quoted, 192.

Davray, Monsieur, 412.

Dawson, Miss Damer: 159; quo-

tation from speech by, on police-women, 161-163.

Debt: post-bellum problem of national, 248, 249.

Democracy: England's influence on, 3 *et seq.*; effect of, on labor, 5; influence of present war on, 6; meaning of, 9; as a producer of leaders, 10 *et seq.*; purposes of, 12; growth of industrial, 58 *et seq.*; English workman mainspring of, 75, 76; three great sons of, 80; demands of England on new, 82 *et seq.*; war run by, 238, 239, 252; attitude of, toward leaders, 254 *et seq.*; compulsory, 367, 368.

Democratic control: explanation of, 53 *et seq.*; Dr. Graham Wallas quoted on, 56.

Denmark: relation of, to social problems, 69 *et seq.*

Desborough, Selborne, 363.

Despard, Mrs., 101.

Detroit: a model industrial city, 75.

Dickens, Charles, 261.

Dickinson, Lowes, 277, 314.

Disraeli, Benjamin: quoted on tariff, 249, 250, 329.

Dixmude, 70.

Domestic policy: attitude of colonies toward England's, 4.

Domestic service: war's effect on, 137.

Donnington Hall, 278.

Dostoyevsky: quoted on freedom, 78.

Dreyfus trial, 176.

Drummond, Mrs. (The General): Lloyd-George and, 20, 158; comparison of, with Chesterton, 258, 259.

INDEX

Dublin: congested population of, 207.

Du Cros: women in the factory, 105.

Dunraven, Lord, 363.

Dunsany, 180.

"Edinburgh Review," 274.

Education: systems of, in England, 305 *et seq.*

"Elements of Reconstruction," pamphlet: quoted, 407.

Ellis, Havelock: quotation from "Essays in War Time," by, 116, 119, 124, 314; quoted on English arrogance, 349.

Empire resources, 231, 232.

England: influence of, on democracy, 3 *et seq.*; extension of power of, 4 *et seq.*; tendency of, toward coöperative socialism, 15; solution of labor problem in, 18 *et seq.*; privileged classes in, 26 *et seq.*; penalty to, if industrial democracy fail, 35 *et seq.*, 58, 59; influence of, upon Russia, 64; effect upon, of cheap transportation for workmen, 70, 71; the supreme need of England, 71-73; demands of new democracy on England, 82; Zimmern's views on industrial Germanization of, 89-94; champion of freedom and justice, 183; spirit of, at war, 228 *et seq.*; why, will win present war, 231 *et seq.*; temperament of people of, 231, 232; attitude of, toward tariff on McKinley basis, 249; heart of social problem of, 250; demand of, for representation, 254 *et seq.*; emotional change in, 257 *et seq.*; question of liberty in, 274 *et seq.*; attitude of, toward free speech, 274-281; "right of asylum" granted by, 281-291; patriarchal, compared with modern, 292, 293; passing of Little, 293-296; public opinion in, on peace, 299-301; systems of education in, 305 *et seq.*; co-existent civilizations in, 309-312; study of coöperation in, 368-380.

English: "a sentimental nation," 240.

English Coöoperative Wholesale Society, 372.

"English Prose Rhymes," anthology, by Professor George Saintsbury, 314.

Englishmen: individuality of, 16; faults of, 40, 41; nationality of, 329-336.

Esher, Viscount, 381.

"Essays in War Time": quotation from, by Havelock Ellis, 116, 119, 124, 314.

"Eugenics Review," 412.

Euripides: quoted on woman's emancipation, 393.

Europe: impossibility of united commonwealths of, 6; democratic forces in, 80; effect on, woman's fight for political recognition, 95 *et seq.*

"Evening Gazette," Cedar Rapids, Iowa: opinion of, of Captain Hans Rose, 317.

"Everyman," 272.

Exports: Irish, to Great Britain in 1916, 217.

Fabian Research Committee, 373.

Fabian Society, 313.

INDEX

Factories: joint boards in, 50; effect of war on, 242-245.

Fall River, 250.

Fawcett, Mrs., 101, 390.

"Fecundity versus Civilization," by Adelyne More: quotations from, 390-393.

Female. *See* Woman.

Feminists of the War Office and Admiralty, 118 *et seq.*

Fisher, H. A. L., minister of education, 303, 304.

Fitz-Gibbon, Philip John: letter from, 411.

Ford, Henry, 207, 337.

Foreign policy: attitude of colonies toward England's, 4 *et seq.*

"Fortnightly Review," 273.

"Forward," 274.

France: the privileged classes in, 26, 27, 96, 176; nationality in, 326.

Franklin, Benjamin, 323.

Free Speech: attitude of England toward, 274-281.

Free trade: Disraeli quoted on, 249, 250.

"Freeman's Journal": quotation from, on agriculture, 400.

French communards, 283.

French railway strike, 41.

French reactionaries, 15.

French Revolution, 41, 96.

Furnes, 70.

Gaelic: effect of study of, 182.

Galsworthy, 272.

Gardiner, A. G., 271.

Garton, Sir Richard, 381.

Garton Foundation: result of investigation of, quoted, 381.

Garvin, J. L., 272.

"General, The" (Mrs. Drummond): 158; comparison with Chesterton, 258, 259.

Germany: attitude of, toward woman, 100, 243; ignorance of, as to England's resources, 278, 279.

Ghent, 70, 86.

Gillingham: domestics' war-savvings association of, 237.

Gilmour, Lennox: campaign story told by, 234-236.

Giovanitti, 189.

Girl: letter of, revealing true war spirit of England, 230, 231.

Gould, Baring, 311.

Great Britain: changes in government leadership of, 3 *et seq.*; effect of war on relations between, and colonies, 7 *et seq.*, 100, 252; northern and western, in fight for democracy, 291 *et seq.*; public opinion in, 291-302; study of co-operation in, 363-380; tariff reform in, 407. *See also* England.

"Great Society, The," by Graham Wallas: passage from, on rights of small nations, 211.

"Greek Commonwealth, The": quoted on professional women, 292, 293.

Gregory, Lady, 180.

Grey, Viscount, 270, 363.

Grimsby: relation of, to war-savings, 237.

Gwynne, 14, 248.

Gymnastic Teachers' Suffrage Society, 103.

Hague Conference: stimulus of, to British commonwealth, 253.

Haig, Sir Douglas, 3.

INDEX

Harcourt, Lewis: quoted on public ownership, 377.

Harrison, Austin, 248.

Hay, John, 323.

Henderson, Arthur, 311.

Henry, O., 279.

Henson, Dean, 367.

"Herald" (London), 272.

"Hibbert Journal," 274.

Hodge, Mr., Minister of Labor; quoted on war's effect on new plants, 242; on free trade, 250.

Holy Alliance, 321.

Home Office, 62.

Home Rule: new Irish attitude toward, 181, 182, 193-227, *passim*.

Hornsey, 160.

Hours: influence of long, on social movement, 25.

Housing, 23, 69, 70, 384-386.

"How the Laborer Lives": quotation from, on rural conditions, 385, 386.

Howells, William Dean, 272.

Hughes, Mr., premier of Australia, 254.

Huguenots, 283.

Hysteria: growth of, among English middle class, 258 *et seq.*

Independent Labor party, 90.

India, 4, 5.

Industrialism, 67 *et seq.* See also Workmen.

Inge, Dean: quoted on "industrial celibacy," 392; on future of British Commonwealth, 413.

International relations: problem of, 11.

Ireland: pioneer work of, in peasant proprietorship, 22; nationalism in, 173 *et seq.*; force of tradition in, 175, 176; industrial activities of, 179; attitude of the man in the street toward, 189, 190; total cultivated area and proportionate productiveness of, 219, 220; uncultivated land in, 219-225; how, must be ruled, 219, 220; financial gain of, since the 50's, 222 *et seq.*, 252.

Irish agriculture, 400-403.

Irish Agricultural Organization Society, 179.

Irish-Americans, 208.

Irish newspapers: independence of, 263, 264.

Irish people: changed attitude of, toward Redmond, 255.

Irish players, 180.

Irish question: 173 *et seq.*; real, poverty, 206; a stumbling-block to England's conduct of present war, 209 *et seq.*; English public opinion on, 297-299.

Irish railways: 397-400; British government control of, 399.

Irish rebellion, 173-227, *passim*.

James, Senator Ollie: quoted on America's attitude toward present war, 317.

James, Professor William, 340.

Jameson, Sir Starr, 363.

"John Bull": 267, 295; extracts from, 410.

Joint committees: settlement by, of trade disputes, 49 *et seq.*

Journalism: studies in British, 260-274; effect of war on, 263-267.

K1: 334.

K2: 334.

K3: 334.

INDEX

K4: 335.
K5: 335.
"Kansas City Star," 271.
Keithley: war savings of, 237.
Kenney, Miss, 259.
Kerr, P. H., 253.
Key, Ellen, 118.
Kipling, Rudyard, 248, 273, 279, 363.
Kitchener, Lord, 384.
Kropotkin, 283.

La Panne, 70.
Labor: effect of democracy on, problem, 5; effect of war on, 14 *et seq.*; shell-making as light on problem of, 18; effect of peace on, quotation, 42, 43; future of, 73 *et seq.*
Labor College, 353-362.
"Labor Leader," 274.
Lady help: salary and duties of, 147, 148, 150; at ladies' hostel for war workers, 151; at army pay officers' mess, 152; at lodging-house, 153.
Lancaster, Ray, 253.
"Land and Labor—Lessons from Belgium," by Seeböhm
Rowntree: quotation from, 387.
Land Courts: advocacy of, 360.
Land Inquiry Committee, 357-360.
Landlordism, 212 *et seq.*
Lansbury, George, 272.
Lasker, Bruno, 313.
Law, Sidney: quoted on decay of Parliament, 404.
Leaders: cause of change in, of government, 5; requirements of, in a democracy, 9 *et seq.*; England's need of wise, 71 *et seq.*; of the woman move-
ment, 101 *et seq.*; demand for representative, 254 *et seq.*
League of the Society of Friends, 103.
Lee, Robert E., 190.
Leisure: the problem of, 61 *et seq.*, 68.
Lever, Sir William, 364.
Life: rules for "playing the game" of, 86 *et seq.*
Lincoln, Abraham: product of democracy, 80, 323.
Literature: effect of social movement on, 314 *et seq.*
Lloyd-George: 3; attitude toward drink, 18; and suffragettes, 20, 25, 62, 100, 185; opinion of, on spirit of England, 229, 230; Bottomley on, 268, 293; study of, 337-345; quoted on editors, 340.
London Graduates' Union for Women's Suffrage, 103.
Lusitania, 322, 324.
Lyburn, E. St. John: quoted on coal fields of Ireland, 399.

MacArthur, Mary, 101.
MacDonald, Ramsay, 62, 277.
MacNeill, Professor: quoted on partition question, 194-196.
Machinery: modern automatic, 22, 59; problem of new, 243-245.
Mafeking Night, 257.
Maine, 322.
Mallon, J. J.: 62; quoted on trade-unions, 397.
"Manchester Guardian," 271, 293.
Man-supported family: passing of the, 105.
Marine engines, 17.
Marne, 176.

INDEX

Marx, Karl: influence of, on English labor, 90, 283.

Massachusetts: minimum wage of women in, 98.

Massingham, H. W., 311.

Mauretania: 65.

Maxse, Leo: 248; quoted on United States, 298.

Mazzini, genius of democracy, 80, 283.

Meath, Earl of: on uncultivated land in Ireland, 220, 221.

Melle, 70.

Milner: type of political mind of, 8, 253, 262, 266, 329; quoted on trusts, 403.

Ministry: meaning of changes in British, 7 *et seq.*

Money, Sir Leo Chiozza: quoted on effect of war on work, 365, 366.

Monroe, James, 323.

Monroe Doctrine, 321 *et seq.*

Montreal, 298.

Moore, George, 180.

More, Adelyne: on birth-control, 390, 391.

"Morning Post" (London), 266, 298, 299.

Morris, William, 68, 67, 68, 90.

Mounteagle, 188.

Muir, Professor Ramsay: quoted on Irish tradition, 175, 176.

Munition factories: future uses of, 244, 245.

Munitions: relation of, to labor problem, 18: women and, 20 *et seq.*

Naquet, Alfred: quoted on birth-control, 391.

"Nation," 264-266.

National Industrial and Profes-

sional Women's Suffrage Society, 103.

National Mission of Repentance and Hope, 30.

"National Review," 298.

National Sailors' and Firemen's Union, 285.

Nationality, 326-336.

Nelson, Horatio, 3.

"New Age," 274.

New Constitutional Society, 103.

"New Ireland": editors of, 264.

"New Republic": 264.

"New Statesman," 274.

New Union, 103.

"New Witness," 260-263.

New Zealand, 4.

Newborough, Lieutenant Lord: extract from will of, 412.

Newman, Sir George: quoted on child welfare, 407.

Nicoll, Robertson, 272.

Nieuport, 70.

North Nibley: war fund raised in, 236.

Northampton: war subscription of, 237.

Northcliffe, Lord: quoted on British army, 228, 248; personality of, 269; influence of, on English ideas, 270, 271, 295, 311, 410, 411.

Norwich: war-savings of, 237.

Noyes, Alfred, 279.

"Observer," 272, 411.

Ostend, 70.

Oxford: influence of, on class system, 28.

Pankhurst, Mrs.: 20, 159; effect of war on militancy of, 254 *et seq.*; personality of, 258.

INDEX

Pankhurst, Sylvia, 101, 277.
Parliament: effect of war on control of, over industrial legislation, 246 *et seq.*; decay of, 404-407.
"Partition": a farce comedy, described, 193, 194.
Patriotism: local, of Englishmen, 412.
Pauperism in Ireland, 206-227.
Peace: program for dealing with unemployed on dawn of, 21 *et seq.*
Peasantry: effect of class system on, 28.
People's Suffrage Federation, 103.
Personal-morality campaign, 18.
Picardy, 96, 278.
Pitt, William, 3.
Platform of new social movement, 18 *et seq.*
Plunkett, Horace, 179, 188, 363.
Plunkett House, 218.
Poland, 96, 176.
Police Commissioner of Scotland Yard: quoted on war spirit of English, 229.
Policewomen in England, 154 *et seq.*
Ponsonby, 277.
"Popular Magazine," 310.
Preston: war-savings of, 238.
Prince, Morton, 323.
Protective agencies: establishment of, in munitions plants, 25.
Prothero, 269.
Proud, Miss: quoted on women in industry, 389.
"Prussianism": fight against, 42.
Public houses, 30.
"Punch," 268.
"Quarterly Review," 274.
Raemaekers, 270.
Railroads: inadequacy of, in Ireland, 216; Belgium's proportion of light, compared with Great Britain's, 386, 387; Irish, 397-400.
"Railway Review," 285, 286.
Rathbone, Eleanor: 101; cited on military and naval feminists, 119-121.
Reconstruction: demand for state and industrial, 10 *et seq.*
Recruits: local patriotism of English, 332 *et seq.*
Redmond, John: leader of Irish Nationalists, 254, 255, 256.
Reeves, Mrs. Pember, 101.
Reid, Archdall: on British Commonwealth, 412, 413.
Rhondda, Lord: dictator of Welsh press, 246, 311, 379.
Roads: plan for improved, 23.
Rockefeller, John D., 404.
Roosevelt, Theodore, 340.
"Round Table, The": 59, 187, 253, 273, 313; quoted on Sir Hugh Bell's analysis of his expenses, 382.
Roumania: labor societies in, 226.
Rowntree, Seebohm: 25, 62; quoted on modern machinery, 65; welfare work of, 229, 269, 313, 339, 350.
Royden, Maude, 101.
Runciman, Mr.: quoted on Irish agricultural conditions due to war, 401.
Ruskin, John, 67, 90.
Russell, Bertrand A. W., 14.
Russell, Bertrand: quoted on race decline, 122, 123; author of "Why Men Fight," 265, 275, 314.

INDEX

Russell, Earl: on right of asylum, 288.

Russell, George, 188, 198 *et seq.*, 264. *See A. E.*

Russell, T. W.: statement of, on transportation, 398; cited on Irish acreage, 400.

Russia: need of leaders to deal with, 9; influence of England's progress upon, 64.

Russian peasantry *versus* English masses, 31, 32.

Russian Political Prisoners' and Exiles' Relief committee, 286.

Russian refugees in England, 283-291.

Russian Seamen's Union, 284.

Rutgers, Dr.: quoted by Frau Stritt, 390.

Sainte-Beuve: Lloyd-George compared with, 340, 341.

Saintsbury, George, 314.

Salvation Army, 257.

Samuel, Herbert: quoted on Russian refugees, 287, 288.

Sanger, Mrs., 116.

Sarno, Charles, 287.

"Saturday Review," 36, 266.

Schoolboys: war-savings of, 238.

Scott: Antarctic explorer, 330.

Shaw, Bernard, 180, 272, 313.

Sheffield, Lord: on right of asylum, 288, 290.

Shop girl: advantages of being a, 108.

Siamese Twin, The (Ulster), 192-206.

Sigerson, Dora, 180.

Sinn Fein: principle of, 218.

Slater, Dr. Gilbert: quoted on tenant farmers, 361, 362.

Snowden, Philip, 62, 277.

Snowden, Mrs. Philip, 101.

Social revolution in England, 14 *et seq.*

Social studies, 228-336.

Social workers: part played in government administration by, 246, *et seq.*

Socialism: in Germany: 15 *et seq.*, 55, 368-380, *passim*.

Society of Women Graduates, 103.

Soldiers, post-bellum problem of, 250, 251.

South Africa, 4.

South Wales, 9.

Spalding, H. N., 304, 339, 350.

Spanish-American War, 322.

Speaker's Franchise Conference, 395.

"Spectator": quoted on molding public opinion, 248.

"Springfield Republican," 271.

Standardization: effect of, of tools, 243 *et seq.*

Status of colonies: change of, 4; effect of war on, 6 *et seq.*

Stephens, James: 180: quoted on Irish freedom, 197; opinion of, on George Russell, 198, 264.

Strachey, St. Loe, 248.

Stritt, Frau: president Woman Suffrage Union, quoted on birth-control, 390.

Suffrage: societies, 103; 395-397. *See Woman, also Woman question.*

Suffrage Atelier, 103.

Sutherland, Duke of: quoted on landed property, 356, 357.

Sweden: in relation to social problems, 69 *et seq.*

Sydney, 298.

Syndicalism, 55, 363-380, *passim*.

INDEX

Tables of wages and duties of lady help, 146-153.

Tagore; quoted on nationalism, 327.

Tammany Hall, 102.

Tariff: attitude of England toward, 249, 250; reform in Great Britain, 363-380, 407.

Taxation: pressure of, 25: solution of problem of, 248, 249.

Taylor, Frederick: quoted on social reform, 78.

Tenant farmers: in Ireland, 212 *et seq.*, 357 *et seq.*

Tenant, Mr.: organization of labor forces by, 49.

Thorndike, 92.

"Times" (London) 36; cited on new machinery and buildings, 242 *et seq.*; quoted on educational status of miners, 354, 355, 367.

Tolstoy: advice of, on social reform, 78.

"Top Notch," 310.

Tory: specific meaning of, 8.

"Tory Tradition, The": 26; quoted on national prosperity, 249.

Town-planning: reform movement in, for workmen, 69, 70.

Trade Unions: new concessions of, to woman, 144, 395-397.

Transportation: cheap, for workmen, 70.

Trevelyan, 277, 300, 301.

Trinity College (Dublin), 178, 179.

Trusts: effect of mechanical standardization on, 245; Lord Rhondda in relation to, 246, 403, 404.

"Truth," 274.

Turks: relative passive resistance of Englishmen and, 89.

Tynan, Katharine, 180, 264.

U-53, 317, 324.

Ulster (The Siamese Twin), 192-206.

United States: in relation to enduring literature, 93, 243. *See America.*

Verdun: 176, 278; Lloyd-George at, 341.

Wages: influence of, on social movement, 25: key to problem of, 49; effect of higher, on workmen, 68; relative, of women in England and America, 98 *et seq.*; post-bellum problem of, 249 *et seq.*; labor's demand for higher, 383, 384.

Wallas, Professor Graham: opinion of, on democratic control, 56; quotation from "The Great Society," by, on the rights of little nations, 211; quoted on Walter Lippman, 266, 289, 314.

War: influence of, on plan of British Commonwealth, 6; tendency of, to fertilize radical ideas, 14; effect of, on trade unions, 17; effect of, on England's middle class, 33; social problem created by, 228-352.

War conference: influence of, on imperial constitution, 4 *et seq.*

War Council, 405.

War savings, 232 *et seq.*

War work: women and, 106.

Waterways: plan for, 23.

Watson, William, 272.

INDEX

Watterson, Colonel, 271.
Webb, Sidney: 13, 261; quoted on birth-control, 392.
Webb, Mrs. Sidney, 101.
Welfare: work, 25 *et seq.*; effect of, department of government on relation between employer and employed, 68.
"Welfare Work," by Miss Proud: quoted on women in industry, 389, 390.
Welldon, Dean: wisdom of, as a leader, 29.
Wellington, Duke of, 3.
Wells, H. G., 13, 248, 272, 313.
"Welsh Outlook": quoted on Lord Rhondda's dictatorship, 246.
"Westminster Gazette," 271.
Wharton, Edith, 272.
Whitman, Walt: quoted on democracy, 80.
"Why Men Fight," by Bertrand Russell: quotation from, on birth-control, 114-116, 265, 275.
Wigstan Magna: record of, on war-savings certificates, 236.
Williams, Captain Basil: quoted on English people, 240, 332.
Wilson, President Woodrow: 148; quoted on present war, 317.
Woman question: solution of, 19, 20; full exposition of, 97-173, 395-397.
"Woman Worker": organ of women trade-unionists, quoted, 255, 256.
Women: services of, in national industries, 20 *et seq.*; emancipation of, 95 *et seq.*; suffrage societies of, 103; war work and, 106; future of, in England, 128 *et seq.*; Seebohm Rowntree's work in behalf of, 135; post-bellum prospect for, 282; in industry, 389, 390; population and, 390-393; increased expenditure of, for clothes, 393-395.
Women police service, 159.
Woolf, 253.
Workers' control, 381-384.
Workers' Educational Association, 77.
Workmen: effect of war on efficiency of, 16 *et seq.*; wishes of, 44, 45; attitude of, toward modern machinery, 66; effect of leisure on, 68; condition of, after hours, 69, 70; mission of, 75 *et seq.*; attitude of English, toward patriotism, 275 *et seq.*; productive power of, during war, 365, 366.
Workshop councils: meaning of, 50 *et seq.*, 380.
Yarmouth: Zeppelins at, incentive to war subscription, 236.
Yeats, 180.
"Yorkshire Factory Times," 285, 286.
Young England: voice of, on solution of Irish question, quotation, 186-191.
Younger Suffragists, 108.
Ypres, 96.
Zele, 70.
Zimmern, A. E.: views of, on pioneers of social reform, 89 *et seq.*, 269, 273, 304; quoted on nationality, 328; cited on backward races, 407, 408.

THE CHAUTAUQUA LITERARY AND SCIENTIFIC CIRCLE

Home Reading Department of Chautauqua Institution
Founded in 1878

This volume is part of a system of home reading the essential features of which are:

1. **A Definite Course** covering four years, and including History, Literature, Art, Travel, Science, etc. (A reader may enroll for only one year.) No examinations.
2. **Specified Volumes** approved by the Councillors. Many of the books are especially prepared for the purpose.
3. **Allotment of Time.** The reading is apportioned by the week or month.
4. **Current Topics**, week by week in one of the foremost publications of America, *The Independent*.
5. **A Monthly Bulletin**, *The Round Table*, giving helps and hints for home study, circle programs, notes from the field, teaching and illustrative material.
6. **A Question Book**, serving as the outline of a written report on each year's reading, should the individual choose to make such.
7. **Individual Readers**, no matter how isolated, may have all the privileges.
8. **Local Circles** may be formed by three or more members for mutual aid and encouragement.
9. **The Time Required** is no more than the average person wastes in disconnected, desultory reading.
10. **Certificates** are granted each year and a diploma at the end of four years to all who complete the course.

The annual cost is about \$5 for books, *The Independent*, *The Round Table*, enrollment, and all necessary helps. For full information address.

CHAUTAUQUA INSTITUTION
CHAUTAUQUA, N. Y.

